Life and Culture of the Indian People

Life and Culture of the Indian People

A HISTORICAL SURVEY

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI
G. SRINIVASACHARI



ALLIED PUBLISHERS
BOMBAY CALCUTTA NEW DELHI
MADRAS BANGALORE

First Published 1966
Second Revised Edition 1974

ALLIED PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED
15 Graham Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay 400001
17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 700013
13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110001
150/B-6 Mount Road, Madras 600002
5th Main Road, Gandhinagar, Bangalore 560009

SBN 85655 131 7

Printed in India
by Om Parkash at the Caxton Press Private Limited
New Delhi 110055, and Published by
R.N. Sachdev for Allied Publishers Private Limited
13/14 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi 110001

Preface

THE purpose of this brief survey of the history of India is to give a panoramic view of the march of events from the earliest known times to the present day, so as to create and sustain in the reader an interest in the history and philosophy of India. The book is designed to help the reader appreciate the vast scope and value of Indian thought.

The political, social and economic problems of the country after 1947 when the country gained independence have, in this book, received greater attention than the history of the past. To disentangle the story from the bewildering rise and fall of various dynasties in the pre-British period, and from the intriguing wars and alliances of the British to attain primacy in India for presenting just what is necessary of the past to understand the present was no easy task for us. We leave the reader to judge the measure of success that has attended our efforts in this direction.

Our presentation will, we hope, convince the reader that India is fast developing into a free democracy and that the

economic and social experiments she has been carrying out are calculated to help her take her legitimate place among the great nations of the world.

If this book serves to help young men and women of India to feel that they may well be proud of their past and build up a future on the flexible traditional values of the nation absorbing what is best in the West and if it in some measure, be it ever so small, serves to build a bridge of understanding between other nations, whatever their form of government may be, and India, we shall feel that our labours in producing it have been amply rewarded.

* * *

This second edition of *India: A Historical Survey* is appropriately titled *Life and Culture of the Indian People : A Historical Survey*. The process of revision has involved some rearrangement of matter and minor deletions; important events that happened in the period 1966-72 are added. We believe that the additions made will give the general reader the background necessary for an intelligent understanding of the complex conditions of the world of 70's and for proper appreciation of India's role in world affairs.

K.A. NILAKANTA SASTRI
G. SRINIVASACHARI

Madras, 1974

Contents

CHAPTER ONE

India—a Paradox

1. INDIA—A PART OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY

THE name India comes from the name of the river which the Indians called 'Sindhu', the Persians 'Hindu' and the Greeks 'Indus'. Foreign historians have consistently been calling the country India. Indians themselves called their land Bharatavarsha after the name of Bharata, the son of Dushyanta and Sakuntala. They regarded Bharatavarsha as the Southern division of Jambudvipa, one of the seven islands making up the world. The constitution of India retains the name India and also revives the traditional name Bharat.

The most interesting and at the same time very puzzling thing about India is that it has a wider variety of geographic, climatic and economic conditions than any other country in the world. To take climate for example, the southern portions of the country lie within the torrid zone, while its Northern region advances into the temperate zone beyond latitude 35°. The South West and the

North East Monsoons are as important to India as are the perennial snows of the Himalayas. Climate and rainfall are no doubt factors influencing the history of any country, but some historians in their attempt to account for the peculiar traits in the history, philosophy and art of India lay undue emphasis on the enervating climate of the country and the effects of its physical configuration in judging Indian character. The rise of the Maharatta power and of the Sikhs and the renaissance of modern India show clearly that climate as a factor in Indian History is not so very significant as sometimes stated.

The Himalayas on the North and the seas on the East, West and South appear to cut off India from the rest of the world, but while they helped her more to attain her distinct individuality, it never meant isolation of India because of the passes in the mountains and of her central position in the Indian Ocean. She has from the remotest past maintained an unbroken contact with every civilization, the Egyptian, the Sumerian, the Mediterranean and the Chinese. The North Western Passes have been the gateways of India for nomadic tribes of Central Asia to migrate and settle in India. The Himalayas, in spite of their dizzy heights and forbidding snow, have never stood as a complete barrier between the people of India and those of the other side. The ocean held no terrors for Indians who in a spirit of adventure colonized Java, Sumatra, Bali and the entire East Indies. And this was not the beginning but continuation of pre-historic movements.

Prof. Childe in his *Dawn of European Civilization* maintains that the Occident is "indebted to the Orient for the rudiments of arts and crafts that initiated man's emancipation from bondage to his environment and for the foundation of those spiritual ties that coordinate human endeavours". Surely the Orient included India.

The three cycles into which chroniclers usually divide Indian History are the Indo-Aryan, the Indo-Islamic and the Indo-European. In fact it is not possible to divide the history of India into three such clear-cut periods, for these periods naturally overlap one another in social and cultural affairs. Considered from the historiographic point of view they are inter-related, but each had its distinctive applications and atmosphere contributing some-

thing special to the cultural development of India. In India, as elsewhere, the centuries follow a regular progression in spite of revolutionary political changes. True, India was for a long time politically divided into segments but these segments have organically fitted into a culture pattern which made India a distinct entity.

For many years it was held that the earliest human species originated along the southern slopes of the Himalayas, but in the nineteenth century anthropologists on the basis of fragmentary skeletal remains put forward the theory that the African Continent was the birth place of mankind. In recent times some writers on the basis of geological evidence have argued that Southern India containing some of the oldest rocks of the world might well have been the earliest home zone of man, but this theory lacks archaeological evidence in support.

It is agreed that the momentous revolution on domestication of animals and agriculture had its beginning somewhere in South West Asia. By about 5000 B.C. there were permanently settled communities in Palestine, Iraq and Iran; each extended eastward as far as India and West and South to Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean. It must be observed that in Europe the new way of life spread very slowly and that the hunting people of that region remained undisturbed for thousands of years. Early historic migrations were wonderfully long and spread over a large area of the earth. In spite of the natural hazards cultural evolution within a limited region has always outstripped cultural diffusion. The vast Acheulian territory shows a remarkable uniformity in its cultural products. "If collectors went out on from London, Jerusalem, Cape Town and Madras all four might find hand-axes which could not be distinguished one from the other unless it was by the material from which they had been made."[1] But this same level of development cannot mean that somehow men arose independently in all these places about the same time. We are to this day ignorant about the early home zone of *Homo Sapiens*. However, we have got into the habit of tracing the gradual spread of human beings over the globe on the basis of useful guesses made

[1] *History of Mankind*. p. 75, vol. I.

by scientists.

India after its political division in 1947 is a truncated country. Sind, a part of the Punjab, Baluchistan and N.W.F. Province became West Pakistan and East Bengal, East Pakistan. The latter revolted against the former; on April 17, 1971 it declared itself to be independent, fought a war, won it and became Bangla Desh. History shows that the Punjab for ages remained as a frontier province not fully integrated with the rest of India. Later Vedic literature mentions the Punjab and the North West rarely and usually with contempt as impure land where Vedic sacrifices were not performed. By an irony of fate, they have become parts of Pakistan (the land of the pure).

Partition of country into Pakistan and India was viewed as a painful necessity by the nationalists both Hindu and Muslim.

Now the Gandhian principle of non-violence which helped India in winning her freedom has attracted world-wide attention. India has voluntarily chosen to continue to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. This has helped India to retain the love and esteem of the members of the Commonwealth of Nations. "India is in fact a good Commonwealth member; she fulfils her obligations as a member of the sterling area and her treatment of United Kingdom citizens living and working in India is exemplary."[2] As a member of the United Nations Organization India has been making her voice felt on the affairs of the world. Indians have been holding high offices in the U.N.O. and have been members of several important commissions and committees appointed by the U.N.O. and its organs. At the Bandung conference was evolved the principle of the *Panchashila* largely at the instance of India. At present her relations with her neighbours, particularly Pakistan and China, are not altogether happy for reasons which will be given in a later chapter.

India is not militarily mighty. But still most progressive nations of the world consider her as a force for peace in the world. It was during the British period, because of her political subordination, that India remained somewhat in isolation from the rest of the world. Nevertheless, the contact with Britain helped India

[2] *Modern India*, Sir Percival Griffiths, p. 275.

to establish trade and cultural relations with almost every country in the world. The Indo-Islamic cycle which lasted from the twelfth century almost to the end of the eighteenth century brought India into contact with the then most civilized countries of the world. The art and architecture of India influenced Mughal art and in turn allowed themselves to be influenced. In the mediaeval period ,the Arabs held the carrying trade for a long time and through them Bhaskara's Calculus and the Astrolabe, ideas of latitude and longitude and numerals including zero and the decimal system of the place value of the numerals passed from India to Europe. The Hindu period in North India may be said to have ended about the twelfth century A.D. It is the longest period in the history of India. Excavations in South India and Indo-China show that the Romans carried on a flourishing trade with India and South East Asia.

The first early Indian civilization is that of the Indus Valley now in Pakistan. The heyday of the Harappa Culture, as it is called, lasted from 2500 to 1500 B.C. The beginnings only date back to 3000 B.C. There are evidences to show that this civilization had lively contacts with the pre-Akkadian and post-Akkadian Culture of Mesopotamia. It was contemporaneous with the Egyptian civilization. It is said that the muslin in which mummies of Egypt were wrapped went from India. That the early Aryan settlers in India had intimate contact with the people of Persia is clear. Sanskrit, the language of the Aryans, is akin to Greek, Latin and Germanic and Slavic languages.

Buddhism which sprang in the sixth century B.C. commanded tremendous influence outside India in course of time. It claimed converts in China and later in Japan. It became the dominant religion of Tibet and of South East Asia, where, however, Brahminical Hinduism was equally important.

In the closing years of the sixth century B.C. the North West region, now part of Pakistan, was conquered by the Persian King, Darius the Great. This conquest established links between India and the Greek world at the western end of the Persian Empire. Alexander's invasion of India (326 B.C.) was only an extension of his Persian campaign. This brought closer contact of India with Greece.

Chandragupta's empire extended to Kabul in Afghanistan, then called Gandhara. Asoka's trilingual inscription at Kandaher shows the extent of his empire as well as that of the influence of Buddhism.

The civilization of India spread into the countries of the South East Asia; until recently, the coronation ceremonies of the Muhammedan kings there were akin to those of the Hindu Kings. The architecture of Borobudur (Java) and Ankorwat are monumental examples of the spread of Indian culture. The people of the island of Bali to the East of Java still retain Vedic *mantras* and ceremonials.

From the period of pre-history to the present age of atomic energy, India has been in close contact with almost every civilization of every age in the world. Well may it be said that India from time immemorial has been a part of universal history.

The Western Bloc headed by U.S.A. is keenly interested in India because it is the largest democracy in the World. The Communist Bloc headed by Russia is equally interested in India because of the economic planning on the socialist pattern. By her policy of non-alignment India has been retaining a certain measure of the confidence and esteem of both the blocs.

2. THE STORY OF BUILDING UP THE HISTORY OF INDIA

The building up of the history of India has a long and interesting story which requires a volume to itself. A brief review of it is necessary to help the general reader appreciate the hard, patient work of successive generations of Indologists to re-construct the history of India.

In spite of the fact that no country in the world is richer than India in documents, monuments and archives commemorating the facts, public and private, of past history, there is a widespread notion that Indians have no historical sense and no taste for history. A.L. Basham says: "It is perhaps unjust to maintain that India had no sense of history whatever." Indeed the interest that India had in her own past was concentrated not only on the fabulous kings of legendary golden age but also on the great empires with their origin and fall in historical times. The most

ancient book of the world, the *Rig Veda*, contains much reliable historical material. However, sources sufficient to enliven the history of certain periods of Hindu India, with interesting anecdotes and vivid personalities, are no doubt lacking. Kalhana, a Kashmiri poet of the twelfth century A.D., wrote the history of his land in verse and named it *Rajatarangini* (River of Kings). It is of great value for the study of the history of Kashmir, but unfortunately it tells us very little of India as a whole. This, however, suggests that in the courts of ancient kings evidences of chief importance to State were carefully recorded. It is a pity that such records should have been completely lost to us.

To the conquering races of the West, India appeared to be remote from their own ideas and civilization. In the first flush of success they looked down upon the Indians, the Hindus in particular, as inferior to them in every respect. To their discomfiture, they soon learned that India was the first recorded home of the Aryans from a branch of whom their own ancestors were believed to have sprung. It was a wonder to them that at a time when Rome and Athens were yet in the womb of a far-off future, when Troy and Mycenae were unborn, when Sheikh Abraham had not yet founded his race, mothers in the Punjab had been telling their children stories, myths and legends akin to those about the Greek heroes and Gods. Before the Aryans migrated into India, there had been living in the country people whose urban civilization continues to be a marvel of the world.

For a large part of the political history of their country Indians are indebted to foreign travellers and foreign scholars. One of the great moments in Indology was the time when European scholars took active interest in the study of Sanskrit. Until the last half of the nineteenth century the early history of India was known to Europeans only from brief passages in the works of Greek and Latin authors. Early European studies of India's past mostly related to speculations about the link of the Indians with the descendants of Noah and the vanished empires of the Bible. The contribution of Jesuits to the study of Sanskrit is great and the first Sanskrit grammar in "European tongue was written by Father Hanxladen who worked in Malabar from 1699-1732. It must be observed that for all their studies most missionaries

gained no real understanding of India's past." Often they tore passages out of their contexts to hold up to ridicule Hindu beliefs and customs.

The foundations of Indology were laid by Sir William Jones (1746-94) who came to Calcutta as a judge of the Supreme Court, when Warren Hastings was the Governor-General. Jones learnt several important European languages as well as Hebrew, Arabic, Persian and Turkish. He was indeed a linguistic genius. It was he who first enunciated that the Persian and the European languages were derived from a common ancestor other than Hebrew. Charles Wilkins (1740-1836), one of the administrators of the East India Company in Bengal, managed to learn the Sanskrit language. The foundation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal on the first of January 1784 was a turning point in the history of modern Sanskrit studies. Warren Hastings who was offered the post of the President, in all humility, persuaded Jones to accept it.

Asiatic Researches, the journal of the society, took concerted measures to reveal India's past to the world. Several important translations of Sanskrit works appeared in successive issues of *Asiatic Researches*. Important among the translations made by Jones were Kalidasa's *Sakuntala* and the *Law Book of Manu*. Several other European scholars followed the example of these pioneers of Indology. A French scholar Anquetil Duperron published translations of four Upanishads from seventeenth century Persian version. These translations roused the interest of European scholars in Sanskrit literature. It is impossible in a brief survey like this to do justice to all the scholars to whom Indology owes a great deal. The greatest contribution to Sanskrit studies made by England was the splendid edition of *Rig Veda* and the great series of authoritative annotated translations, *Sacred Books of the East*. These two monumental works were done by the great German Sanskritist, Max Muller (1823-1900).

Early in the nineteenth century the Bengal Society, not content with the study of written records, turned its attention to material remains of India's past. The Company surveyors gathered many reports on temples, caves and shrines. They collected early coins and copies of inscription in scripts that were not then in

vogue. The second great moment in Indology came when James Prinsep, an official of the Calcutta Mint and secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, interpreted for the first time the earliest Brahmi script. He was able to read the edicts of the great Emperor Asoka. Among those who with single-hearted devotion addressed themselves to the task of unravelling India's past must be mentioned Cunningham who held the post of Archaeological Surveyor from 1862 to his retirement in 1885. By 1900 through his guidance many ancient buildings had been surveyed, many ancient inscriptions read and translated.

The best service done to India by Lord Curzon was in 1901, when he reformed and enlarged the Archaeological Survey. He appointed a young archaeologist named John Marshall as Director General. Marshall's greatest triumph was the discovery of the Indus Valley civilization. He with the assistance of R. D. Banerjee systematically excavated Harappa and Mohenjodaro from 1924 until his retirement in 1931. Mortimer Wheeler during his brief period of Directorship also made some important discoveries at Harappa. All these discoveries startled historians all over the world, and pushed the evidence of India's antiquity to nearly 3000 B.C. But unfortunately the language of the seals of Harappa still remain undeciphered. Remarkable excavations at Taxila, Sarnath, Nalanda and Sanchi and other historic sites have made very considerable additions to our knowledge of the past and brought certainty and definiteness into its successive epochs. Excavations are still going on; there is no knowing what wonders of the past they may reveal.

Inscriptions of stone and metal counted by hundreds in the North and thousands in the South are among the most copious and authentic sources of ancient Indian History. The history of the early Pallavas and Pandyas would be blank without the evidence from about a score or more copper plate records. The evidence provided for us by the coins issued by the rulers of old help us with much information and fill up the gaps in the history. Coins called *Puranas* were in circulation from seventh century B.C. to the beginning of the Christian Era. About the Indo-Greeks and Kushans coins are our main source of information. Justin and Strabo mentioned not more than four or five princes

of the Indo-Greek line, while coins speak of not less than thirty-seven princes. Some of these coins, so decidedly of Hellenistic conception, depict the influence of Buddhism and Hinduism. These coins unmistakably show cultural intermingling of the East and West. The state of the currency, so far as we can trace, offers a valuable clue to the economic condition of the people. Monuments, sculptures, paintings and other works of art belonging to all periods are invaluable aids to our understanding of the conditions of life that prevailed in respective epochs. The *Puranas* and the epics, *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana,* though obscured by many layers of imaginary legends, do contain useful historical materials, and Vincent Smith was very definite that historians should use the materials contained in them. Buddhist and Jain books of a quasi-historical nature make an invaluable contribution to the study of Indian history.

With the coming in of the Muslims we get an abundance of chronicles and histories, official and private. For example, Ferishta's history written in the early part of seventeenth century is an admirable work of research and synthesis. Among travellers' accounts must be mentioned Herodotus of the fifth century B.C. and Megasthenes who visited Chandragupta's court. Parts of his work have survived to give us an account of the Mauryan administration. The accounts of Chinese Buddhist pilgrims to India such as Fa-hien, Hiuentsang and I-tsing are of unsurpassed value. Alberuni (A.D. 1030) gives an excellent critical account of Hindu society, learning and literature as he found them, but it is of little value as a source of political history.

For Indo-European history we have a mass of contemporary papers, official and private. The field is vast, very little of it has yet been studied from the Indian point of view and Indian scholars have to work quite a number of years to give shape to the history of this period.

Most of the early historians of India have been Europeans. The first reliable book on Ancient India was that of Vincent Smith. Bhandarkar and other Indian scholars have contributed a great deal to the shaping of Indian History. While European orientalists have unbounded admiration and respect for India's literature, religion and art, those who belonged to the utilitarian

school of thought had nothing but contempt for Indian customs, manners and religion. James Mill, father of the liberal Stuart Mill, brushed aside the Hindu period, writing much nonsense about it and began the history of India with the advent of the Muslims. Some Indian scholars, proud of the admiration of orientalists, have been unduly chauvinistic in their writings. Among those that have shown an understanding of the true Indian spirit must be mentioned the Great German Antiquarian Lassen of the nineteenth century, E.B. Havell and A.L. Basham besides many others of different nations like Lanman and Bloomfield in America; Kern and Vogel in Holland; Sten Konow and Fausboll in the Scandinavian countries; Burnouf, Syloain, Levi and Grousset in France. There is an unmistakable tendency among most European writers of the history of India to attempt to trace every thing good in India to the West or to some other foreign origin. In the early days of the British conquest European scholars had opportunities to know more about Muslims than about Hindus. Certain common elements in Christianity and Islam made these scholars favour Muslims; the accident of Muslims having been in power had no small influence on their somewhat respectful attitude towards them. More than all, their superiority complex was heightened by their political success in India. The Hindus who formed the bulk of the population stubbornly resisted attempts at conversion, and presumably because of this Hindus came to be looked down upon by those Europeans who were interested in the spread of Christianity. The tendency to attribute anything good to foreign origin may be seen in the exaggerated importance attached by some Western writers to the influence of Islam and Sermon on the Mount on Tolstoy and Gandhi. The Mahatma was a traditionalist who owed much more to Maratha mystic poetry and *Bhagavadgita* than to any other source. His ideas of human solidarity and brotherhood, his message of Truth, Love and *Ahimsa* are all derived from Hindu precedents.

3. PARADOXES

India is passing through a period of transition. The Chief trend is towards change, but the pace of change and its exact nature

are difficult to describe and much more difficult to evaluate. Most Western writers study India invariably with preconceived notion of contrasting conditions of Eastern and Western cultures. Their hypothesis is that the culture of the East is in many respects a contrast to that of the West, and even conflicting. This is not the place to enter into any great detail about the problem of East versus West.

Science and her naughty daughter technology have so revolutionized the material culture of the world, annihilating distance and radically changing men's minds, that the past is looked down upon as a milestone hanging round the neck of a nation that desires progress in terms of improved standards of living and comfort. In the discussion of the contrasting values of the East and West, even moral qualities and values have acquired contrasting connotations of Eastern and Western civilizations. Hardly is it realized that fundamental moral values are universal. Truth, justice, mercy, kindness, charity and similar moral qualities are valued by all right thinking men everywhere in the world. They know neither East nor West. Falsehood, injustice, cruelty and uncharitableness deserve to be condemned by all, to whatever race, area, sect or caste they may belong. So, fundamental moral values cannot vary with the East or West; the contrast is not at all with the East and the West, but between those who *profess the values and those who practise them. But it is not the* same as saying that what one group considers to be right should also be right for another group. In one society it is right for a person to marry his sister's daughter, but another society may condemn it as wrong. This is purely a matter of custom and no fundamental moral quality is involved in it.

Mayhew, who believed that the spread of Christianity in India, would remove cultural antagonism and ensure the protection of moral values says:

> When we think of what through our instruction, the Indian can do and must do to gain a livelihood, we imagine him in his government or mercantile office, pleading in the law courts, practising in the hospitals, and even doing in executive councils or ministries the work that, for a century, has been reserved

> to the 'Heaven-born' of the Civil Service, he is western and one with us. . . .If we follow the clerk home from his office, or the agricultural labourer, who has achieved literacy in the village school, home from the plough and watch his employment of his leisure, his search after happiness in his family or communal life, we shall find the Oriental, not the Occidental.... Practically everything is shed that has been acquired at such cost from school and college and contact with the West... The western train is used for reaching the place of sacred pilgrimage, and the electric fan for cooling the performer of domestic rites and ceremonies.

Mayhew describes one kind of paradox which seems inexplicable to him.

To another writer the present trend in India appears to be from the old traditional, hierarchical, other-worldly, religion based view of life towards one which, while still rooted in India's past, will reflect increasingly the whole complex of ideas, values, and technology originally borrowed from the West. How fast will the transition be? How much will be taken from the West permanently, now that India is free to choose? If the contrast between the old and the new were only a matter of technology, the answer would be clear. India is adopting as much of Western industrial technology as she can afford to do and as quickly as possible.[3] The hypothesis of the writer is that ideas and values of the technological age are Western and if Eastern countries adopted them they should be regarded as borrowings. A little reflection will show that neither science nor technology can truly be called Western or Eastern. All scientific invention and technological devices, wherever they may have originated belong to the world, not to the area or the people living in it. The spread of the use of machinery for agricultural and industrial pursuits is primarily a question of time and money and not of the East or the West.

Somehow or other the contrasting conditions of the East and the West have become fixed even in the minds of great men who

[3] Beatrice Pithey Lamb, *A World in Transition*, p. 333.

have striven to rise above narrow nationalism. Twelve years before becoming Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, when he was in prison wrote:

> I have become a queer mixture of the East and the West, out of place everywhere, at home nowhere. Perhaps my thoughts and approach to life are more akin to what is called Western than Eastern, but India clings to me as she does to all her children, in innumerable ways. . . .I am a stranger and alien in the West. I cannot be of it. But in my own country also sometimes I have an exile's feeling.

This is Nehru's introspection; he refers to conditions of life in India that are very different from those he experienced during his stay in England. This does mean that Nehru argues that Eastern civilization is different from that of the West.

It is a paradox that the general masses of India have a kind of hostility towards the things of the West. All great Indians of the nineteenth century were not able to gain any recognition from their own countrymen, nor exert any influence over them until they were recognized in the West. Swami Vivekananda's case serves as a fitting example. He was respected only after he had made his name in America. He was conscious of a gulf between himself and the mass of India. He was a staunch supporter of the national tradition. But in an involuntary slip he seemes to throw away his case: "Can you make a European Society with, India's religion?" he asked and he answered, "I believe it is possible and must be." The Swami perhaps thought that India's religion was incompatible with European society. But he was so attracted by the high standard of life of the Europeans that he very much wished that the poor Indian could somehow be helped to improve his standard of living.

India presents a variety of natural regions and climate. It presents a combination of elements that seem to belong to different worlds. All ethnic groups of the world are found living in India to this day. The streets in any city present handcarts pulled by men, bullockcarts, lorries and motor-cars, while aeroplanes fly high in the sky. It is these contrasting differences that make

India interesting as well as confusing to foreigners.

From the incongruities of India it is wrong to think, as some Western writers do, that the Indians have any innate or religious disability to draw new life from the soil or use machinery for their industries. As for political theories, the *Artha Sastra* in Sanskrit was a favourite special of Indians some centuries before the Christian Era. This shows the early development of Indian political science. "The king", wrote Yajnavalkya, "must discipline and establish again on the path of duty, all such as have erred from their own laws whether families, castes, guilds or associations." Buddhist texts give examples of representative self-governing institutions. It may come as a surprise to many Westerners unacquainted with India that in the assemblies of the Buddhists in India 2000 years ago, there were rudiments of the British Parliamentary practice of the present day. There were officers to preserve the dignity of the house such as are akin to those of the modern 'speaker' and 'chief whip'. The member of the assembly initiating business brought forward a motion which was then open to discussion. There was also a custom of reading a resolution three times befort it became law. Difference of opinion on any matter by the vote of the majority, the voting done by a ballot. In South India an inscription of the tenth century A.D. in the Vaikuntha Perumal Temple at Uttaramallur gives numerous details about the system of village self-government, including the principle of election. Thus it will be seen that the system of representative government was long known in India. If a union of Hindu and European learning has not been sufficiently effected this should be attributed to the failure of British rule in India. We will in a separate chapter note the developments of democracy in India. What is puzzling to some Westerners is the three ways by which the Hindu sought to reach his spiritual goal, namely, the *Gnana Marga* or Way of Knowledge, *Karma Marga* or Way of Action, and the *Bhakti Marga* or Way of Complete Devotion to God. We will later show that *Dharma*, *Karma* and *Maya* of the Hindu do not stand in the way of political or economic progress of India.

Religion and Nationalism. Almost all major religions of the world are represented in India. The bulk of the population

belong to Hindu religion. Hinduism defies definition. Hindu culture has shown its vitality by maintaining its tradition unbroken to the present day from the fourth millennium B.C. in spite of several attacks, Hellenic, Muslim and European among others. Its historic vitality shows that it has been built on the bedrock of spirituality ; as it is built on intuitive wisdom it is of permanent value. It can never become obsolete.

Hinduism adopts the attitude of toleration. It recognizes the relative truths in all other religions. Its toleration is not a matter of policy, or expediency. It is enjoined as a duty. Some great thinkers of the world who have studied the spiritual basis of Hinduism believe that the basic principles of Hindu religion would help to establish a just social order and bring about generous human relations among peoples of the world.

Nationalism is a historic phenomenon; there was a time when it did not exist. Its first appearance in Europe was in Germany during the illfamed Thirty Years War (1618-48). Especially after the French Revolution (1789) nationalism to some extent took the place of religion. If nationalism is regarded as something more than the serving of the population of a country, for attainment of political independence, we cannot say when exactly it began in India. As a political movement we may say it began with the birth of the Indian National Congress in 1885. Regionalism, casteism and linguism are factors that affect the development of nationalism. India is trying to overcome in her own way the forces that operate against national unity and solidarity by trying to establish a just social order bringing about economic improvement of the masses.

In 1947 India achieved success in her political revolution. This was led by the intelligentsia of the country with the support of industrialists and merchant community and of the masses under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. The duration of the active struggle for independence was only a few decades.

With the dawn of independence a social and economic revolution was set in motion. The most important aim of this revolution is to improve standard of living of the masses by developing on a vast scale modern industry and communications system. The number of people who can be classed as rich is

comparatively small in India. The population of India is a little over 439 million. This is bound to increase in the future, as the figure of 1961 census shows, the birth rate per thousand in 1951 was 40.9, in 1961 it was 40; almost static, the death rate has decreased from 27.4 to 18.0 while expectation on life at birth has increased from 32 to 45. The problem of India's poverty is very serious. The question is: how quickly can the social and economic revolution be effected?

A comparison of the earlier industrial revolution in Europe will be instructive. Taking 1750 as the beginning of the industrial revolution in Britain we may say that British industry has had nearly two centuries in which to develop. France and the United States have had a century and a half, Germany a century and Russia and Japan half a century. The example of England in the passing of factory laws makes India avoid the incidental troubles in the matter of treatment of labour. What time can India take for the development of her industry? Her Five Year Plans provide an answer which will be dealt with in a future chapter. Will the rapidity of the increase in India's population mean that the standard of living may not rise but fall? This question too will be discussed later. One thing seems clear that the peasants and agricultural labourers are already impatient. They cannot put up with conditions in which their standard of living will rise only slowly. On 26 August 1963, the Planning Minister G.L. Nanda pointed out that the average per capita 'consumer expenditure' of [60 per cent of the population was seven and a half annas per day, while the opposition put it lower still on the basis of national income. Whatever be the actual figure it is a fact that most people in India have to spend more than they earn and are therefore for ever in debt. In such circumstances, the problem of improving the standard of living of the people is an extraordinarily difficult one for the Government of India.

CHAPTER TWO

The People of India

INDIA contains a larger variety of human types than any other country in the world. Palaeolithic and neolithic remains discovered as far apart as Bellary in Andhra and Mirzapur in Uttar Pradesh clearly show that parts of India have been inhabited by people from a remote time. However, the theory put forward is that the ancestors of the Indians came from a number of regions outside India, far removed from one another.

The population of India, according to the census of 1971, is nearly 547 millions; of them the scheduled castes number about 80 millions and the scheduled tribes 38 millions.

It is believed that these tribes are the oldest inhabitants of India, and they are akin to Negritos and Proto-Australoids. The dominant ethnic strains in India are akin to those of the early Mediterranean and the Aryan.

The process of amalgamation of cultures, religions and languages in India began as early as the days of the civilization revea-

led by the excavations at Harappa and Mohenjodaro. This Indus civilization is dated 2500 B.C. The beautiful cities unearthed were built by master planners who had had the accumulated knowledge of several centuries before them. The remains of this civilization in India spread over an area including Kathiawar, Baluchistan, Sind, and The Punjab right up to Rupar. Whether the originators of this civilization were immigrants from somewhere in the Mediterranean region or people indigenous to the soil is still a matter of controversy among scholars.

There is evidence to show that the people of these ancient cities left their abodes in a hurry, but why they did so is still largely a matter of conjecture; may be due to flood or epidemic or invasion. But there is reason to believe that the descendants of those people are still to be found among the inhabitants of India ; and the question who are they? is really difficult to answer.

It may broadly be said that the whites predominate in the North West from Kashmir to Rajputana and the blacks in the South. In the neighbourhood of Tibet and Upper Burma the Mongolian traits of high cheek-bones and yellow skins are in evidence. Admittedly the criteria of race are uncertain and one should be wary of importing any racial conflict in India as distinctly different from cultural or religious conflicts.

According to the census report of 1971 the Hindus were 453 millions (82.8 per cent) as against 366 millions (85 per cent) in 1961. The Muslims rose from 47 millions (10.2 per cent) in 1961 to about 61 millions (11 per cent) in 1971 and the Christians from 10.4 millions (2.4 per cent) to 14 millions (2.5 per cent). The Sikhs rose from 8 millions (1.8 per cent) to 10 millions (1.8 per cent). There has been no notable rise in the percentage of the Buddhist population which continues to be less than one. It was in 1961 that the Buddhists rose nearly eight times over the figure in 1951, presumably because of Dr. Ambedkar's preference to Buddhism for scheduled castes.

There is a fall of a little over two per cent in the Hindu strength in relation to the total population, while there is some slight increase in the percentages of the Muslims and Christians. The fall in the percentage of the Hindu population is generally

attributed to the intensive campaign for family planning amon[g] them, while the Muslims and the Catholics are against it o[n] religious grounds.

The definition of a Hindu according to the law prevailing i[s] bound to be of interest.

> A Hindu is one or other of two classes of persons show[n] below as '*A*' or '*B*':
>
> (*A*) Hindu is a person, irrespective of sex, age, mental condi- tion or religious belief, who is not a Muslim, Christian, Pars[i] or Jew by religion provided (*i*) that he is domiciled in India and (*ii*) that he could have been governed by Hindu law or b[y] any custom derogating from Hindu law if the Code had no[t] been passed....
>
> (*B*) A Hindu may also be a person, whether domiciled in India or not, who is a Hindu by religion. For this purpose all sects and developments of Hinduism, even those which are re- garded as non-Hindu in some respects such as Lingayats or Brahmos, are Hindus; Buddhists, Jains and Sikhs are Hindus for this purpose. Wherever the word 'Hindu' occurs we are to understand a person to whom the Hindu Code applies though he may not be in fact a Hindu by religion according to any theological definition....A convert to, or a reconvert, to the Hindu, Buddhist, Jaini or Sikh religion is a Hindu.[1]

The four great linguistic families of India are : (1) Indo-Aryan (2) Dravidian (3) Austric (4) Sino-Tibetan. At present languages of the Indo-Aryan family prevail practically in the whole of Northern India and Maharashtra, while Easten Deccan and South India constitute the Dravidian Zone.

Recent studies of language have established the existence of another group of languages, called Munda or Kolarian, which belong to the Mon-Khmer family of languages found in Indo- China and are distantly related to other groups falling under Austro-Asiatic. The speakers of these languages are now found in the Mahadeo hills (Kurku tribe), in the Himalayas, and most

[1]*Introduction to Modern Hindu Law*, Duncan. M. Derrett, p. 18-19.

of all in Chota Nagpur (about 3,000,000). They are mostly dark skinned aborigines, but their wide diffusion shows that they must once have occupied a much wider area than now, a conclusion supported by the analysis of place-names. The Munda languages are certainly as old as the Dravidian, probably much older. Some hold that the Aryans met and mingled with the Munda people, and that the changes in the phonetics and vocabulary of the Vedic language can be explained on the basis of Munda influence much better than on that of Dravidian. The almost total disappearance of Munda languages from the North in contrast with the continued survival of Dravidian speeches in the South may also indicate that Munda civilization was less solidly organized than Dravidian.[2]

We do not yet have a clear picture of the origin and early culture of the Dravidian-speaking people. But it is clear that pre-Aryan inhabitants in India were not only people speaking dialects of the Dravidian languages but also others. The Vedic *mantras* mention the names of about forty tribes who inhabited the regions known to their composers. The centre of this region was a district round the Saraswati, south of modern Ambala. These tribes were not primitive. They tilled the ground, raised crops of various kinds and worked in metals. There is evidence to show that they traded with foreign countries exporting teak, peacock, spices, pearls and probably woven cloth.

Caldwell indicated a connection between Susian and Dravidian languages as regards structure. Some ancient place-names in the highlands of Iran and Mesopotamia have been shown to conform to Dravidian forms. The construction, organization and rituals of the temples of ancient Sumeria had much in common with temples of South India. All these show that there was considerable communication between South India and Western Asia in remote times. However, it is difficult to draw definite conclusions about the Dravidians, for the oldest works now available in Dravidian were written long after their contact with Aryan culture.

The early history of India is based on the theory of the Aryan

[2] *History of India*, K.A.N. Sastri, Part I, p. 28.

invasion of India propounded by anthropologists and philologists who were struck by the similarities between Sanskrit and Germanic languages. It cannot at present be definitely stated whether the Dravidian people came to India from outside or were the natives of the country, though most western scholars regard them as the people of the Mediterranean region.

In historical times new elements entered the ranks of Indian people. Their effect on the composition of the Indian society was proportionate to their numbers. Till about the seventh century B.C. mingling of these groups with the inhabitants of India went on. Those who lived at the foot-hills and mountains of the Punjab, Kashmir, and upper Tarai of the Eastern Himalayas appear to have kept a little aloof from the general current of culture. In the thick forests of Western India, there were perhaps tribes who may have resisted changes then as now. Generally speaking, the mingling of the people brought about a composite culture predominantly Aryan. The Aryan social organization and norms appear to have been accepted by the people. In those days intermarriages were common. There were no restrictions about interdining. Society placed no impediments to a man's desire to better himself and religion was largely regarded as an individual's own affair. Even in those early days people appear to have accepted the doctrine of *Karma* and Rebirth. They believed that man enjoyed the possession of the good things of this world according to his good or bad deeds in past life. It was this belief in the doctrine of *Karma* that was largely responsible for promoting a spirit of tolerance.

The Persians came to India in the seventh century before Christ. The Macedonians were followed by the Greeks in the wake of Alexander in the fourth century B.C. For nearly two hundred years, the Parthians and Bactrians from across the Hindukush continued to pour into India. Then came the Sakas and Pahlavas. The Kushans and other tribes from Central Asia made the Punjab and North Western Frontier Province as their home. The Huns came, in somewhat larger numbers, at the close of the Gupta epoch. They established their authority in the Punjab. When Mihrgula's territory was invaded he took refuge in Kashmir and made it a jumping off ground for his

return to the Punjab. All these people were Indianized. Few tangible traces remain of their original identity. It seems probable that the Rajput dynasties that came into prominence in the seventh century A.D. had a large measure of Hunnish blood in their veins. When in the eighth century A.D. the Muslims conquered Persia and forced people to embrace Islam, the Parsis who found it impossible to live peacefully in Persia sought refuge in India. The Parsis, though small in number, have played a great part in the commercial and industrial development of India. To this day they have retained their religion and culture, while the other newcomers before them had accepted Hinduism or Buddhism as their faith.

Colonies of foreign merchants settled along the coast, particularly in South India, from the beginning of the Christian era, if not earlier. The Moplahs of Malabar are the products of union between Muslim merchants from Arabia and the women of the West Coast. The Muslim immigration into India began with the Arab invasion of Sind early in the eighth century culminating in the establishment of the Mughal Empire in the sixteenth century. Among the Muslims that came to India were Iranian Muslims akin to Indo-Aryan, Turks and Mongols. Their merging with the people and conversions of the indigenous population to Islam tended to assimilate the Muslims to the rest of the population in general appearance but they continued to follow their religion. It must be noted that the converts to Islam kept up a large part of their customary law. Even now there are sects among Muslims to whom the Hindu law applies. A common heritage of Hindus and Muslims is veneration for saints and love of festivals.

There is a tradition of doubtful authenticity that St. Thomas, one of the apostles of Christ, came to India from Syria in the early decades of first century A.D. and was martyred. It is unnecessary for us to get into the details of the Northern and Southern theories on the martyrdom of St. Thomas. Syrian Christians in the state of Kerala claim that they belong to the church founded by the Apostle Thomas in person. Whatever may be the truth about the visit of St. Thomas there is good reason to believe that Christians were established as a body in

India by the third century A.D. Syrian Christians number about a million at present. The Jews came to India but not in large numbers. Now there are two communities of Jews living at Cochin in Kerala. Both of them claim to have sought refuge there after the destruction of Jerusalem by Romans in 70 A.D.

The Portuguese were the first Europeans to come to India by an all sea-route via Cape of Good Hope. They were soon followed by the Dutch, English, French and Danes. The Europeans who came to India did not make India their home. Their presence in India, however, added what is called the Anglo-Indian strain to the country. They are Christians in religion and descendants of Indian mothers and European fathers. They have adopted a kind of European way of life. Their number is small.

Thus we find that the people of India belong to different ethnic types, follow different religions and speak different languages. But they are heirs to the composite culture of India. They are all equal citizens of India and are proud that they are Indians.

CHAPTER THREE

Background of History

1. A PANORAMIC VIEW OF HINDU INDIA

WE HAVE noted that Indian history shows a ternary sequence. Chronologically it divides into the Indo-Aryan, the Indo-Islamic and the Indo-British cycles. Each cycle is clear cut and at the same time indivisible against what precedes and follows it. Is the dominant civilization of each cycle a separate species of civilization? Is Indian history fundamentally discontinuous? These are questions which elicit different answers from scholars. This is not the place where we can discuss the matter in all its details. We may, however, say that there is a continuity in the administration, social system and culture of India in spite of the apparently discontinuous, not to say, contradictory cycles. Thanks to the patient work of indologists Indian history has reached a stage when it can present its own synthesis. The generalizer on Indian history with a little will power to get rid of any prepossession that may blur his vision can now say with

the French historian, Fustel de Coulanges : "No applause for me, please, it is history which is speaking through my mouth."

The Indo-Aryan period is the longest in Indian history, for it covers the field from the Vedic age to 1200 A.D. The magnificent urban civilization of Harappa is still regarded as part of the proto-historic age. Further researches may show clearly its indigenous roots and affiliations with Sumer.

The Bharatas, according to the *Rig Veda*, seem to have been the first to adopt the fire rite which still continues in Brahmanical Hinduism. A fire cult of some form or other existed in old days among the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Greeks, the Italians, the Semites and burnt offerings were given to the gods by almost all the nations of antiquity. But the Indian fire cult has peculiar characteristics which indicate its special development in India, independent of foreign influence. Among no other people was the fire god so definitely anthropomorphized as by the Indians.

The people that inhabited the Punjab and the upper Gangetic valley in the age of the *mantras* were not roving hordes of pastoral tribes, but lived in an organized society. They lived in families in villages. The father was the head of the family. They were ruled by kings, many of whom are mentioned by name. Interesting among them are Ikshvaku and Santanu and doughty warriors, Sudas and Trasadasou frequently referred to. Kings resided in forts, sat on a throne "of iron columns, decked with gold". They were surrounded by ministers, and heralds proclaimed their glory. There were messengers to convey their commands. The *mantras* of the *Rig Veda* make us feel sure that the life of the gods was modelled on that of mortal kings. *Satapatha Brahmanam* says, "the course pursued among the gods is in accordance with that pursued among men". We have it that kings attended assemblies clad in robes of state. Hindu royalty was more or less modelled on descriptions given in the *Rig Veda mantras.*

Caste as we know it now in India did not exist in ancient times. But the three higher castes are frequently mentioned and the Sudra, more than half a dozen times in the *mantras.* In that

age priests were generally Brahmanas, but Rajanyas like Viswamitra and Devapi also acted as priests. These were exceptions. Brahmanas were generally *purohits.* Though the people were divided into 'castes', there was no restriction with regard to marriage. Professions too were not restricted to castes. During the age of the *mantras,* the influence of the Brahmanas steadily increased and their claims to social predominance insistently urged. The Brahmanas recognized the necessity for deserving the respect of their patrons and shaped their lives accordingly.

In the time of the Buddha, the Pali texts bring to light the four great kingdoms of Kosala, Magadha, Avanti and Vamsa and, what is more interesting, numerous republics.

Between the monarchies and the republics there were constant conflicts. It was no easy job for the king of Magadha to subjugate the republican Lichchavis. They were the leaders of a vast confederation of thirty-six states. In the Buddha's opinion they were invulnerable and invincible because they were keeping up all conventions "making for the strength and success of a republic, such as holding full and frequent assemblies, unity of counsel and policy, maintaining old traditions, institutions, and worship, reverence to elders, honouring women and ascetics" and so forth. The king of Magadha, however, invaded their territory and after a long and arduous struggle defeated and conquered the Lichchavis.

Videha originally started as a kingdom and a strong-hold of Vedic culture; among the greatest exponents of Vedic culture there were king Janaka and Rishi Yajnavalkya. It is interesting to find that Videha which had been a monarchy with its many distinguished kings was a republic in the Buddha's time. The Buddhist texts show that the Lichchavi republic had a parliament which often met and that the members had great respect for their ancient laws, customs and institutions.

Alexander on his way back home after a successful campaign in the Punjab met with stubborn resistance from the Brahmanas in the states on Ravi and Beas. The Brahmanas were the real power behind the throne and determined to enter into politics. They denounced the submissive princes as traitors and goaded the republican peoples into revolt against Alexander.

They were all, however, put to death by Alexander.

The first largest empire about which there is clear recorded evidence was the Mauryan empire, founded by Chandragupta with the assistance of his master and minister Chanakya, also called Kautilya. Kautilya's *Arthasastra*, accounts of Megasthenes and the inscriptions of Asoka, grandson of Chandragupta, give a complete picture of the polity of the time. The kingdom of Magadha which Chandragupta took over from the Nandas was extensive and well-organized.

In the days of the Mauryans there were large states under absolute monarchs. In spite of their hostility to non-monarchical states, the republican clans continued to maintain their individuality. In this period there was a transition from a rural to money economy. The volume of international trade increased. Diplomatic mission and growing travel multiplied opportunities of contacts and exchanges among the different nations.

The general theory of Ancient Indian Polity was that the king was only the guardian of the law and not its maker, and that his orders should conform to established principles of *Dharma* and social usage. The Mauryan Government was an elaborate bureaucracy with a full complement of departments and a carefully graded hierarchy of officials, urban and rural, with well defined duties. The *Arthasastra* describes over thirty departments of Government each under a superintendent (*adhyaksha*). The king led a strenuous life. Diligence in the affairs concerning the welfare of the people was his first duty. Ministers were of two grades—*mantris* who formed the cabinet and *amatyas*. The king should consult *mantris* and be guided by the majority opinion on all important matters of state.

The government of the capital was almost on the model of the present corporation in cities but with enlarged functions. The town Council of Pataliputra, the capital of Magadha, functioned through six committees or boards dealing respectively with (1) the industrial arts, (2) the entertainment of foreigners, (3) the registration of births and deaths; (4) trade and commerce including weights and measures, (5) supervision and sale of manufactured articles and (6) collection of tithes on sales.

The empire was divided into a number of provinces under

governors or princes acting as viceroys. There were courts to administer justice besides village tribunals where petty disputes were settled by the headman and the elders. The procedure in the courts conformed to rules regarding plea, counter-plea and rejoinder. There was a regular system of appeals right up to the king's court. There was a large standing army adequate for all the needs of the empire, internal and external. Kautilya lays it down: "The happiness of his subjects is the happiness of the king; the good of the subjects his good. What pleases him is not good for the king but what pleases his subjects is." The Mauryan administration set the model for Hindu kings of various dynasties that came after the Mauryans.

Chandragupta's grandson Asoka showed by precept and example that the *Chakra of Power* and *Chakra of Dharma* could be wielded by a single hand. In his time the Mauryan Empire extended as far as the Northern boundaries of Tamil kingdoms. He sent out missionaries for the propagation of Buddhism to Ceylon and other countries. He is regarded as one of the greatest monarchs of the world, for he renounced war after a resounding victory over Kalinga and became the most eloquent exponent of the philosophy of non-violence, *Dharma Vijaya* as he puts it. The state seal of the Government of India today depicts the capital of one of his pillars, that is at Saranath. However, his attempt at the propagation of Buddhism throughout India was not a success. The power of Magadha declined after him, when the Bactrian-Greeks, the Parthians and the Sakas poured into India. We have already said that they merged into the Hindu fold.

Then the Kushans established a great kingdom in North India and this reached its peak in the second century A.D. This kingdom extended from the North Western passes right up to Benares in the East. The Kushans held sway in Central Asia also. Thus their empire served as the meeting ground for the then cultural traditions of India, China, Persia and the Greco-Roman world. It was during the Kushan rule that Mahayana Buddhism took shape and Gandhara art produced beautiful sculptured images of the Buddha.

On the Deccan and the East Coast there arose a mighty

dynasty named the Satavahanas, which may be principally regarded as the successor of the empire of Magadha. On account of barbaric encroachment in the North, the centre of Aryavarta was moved to the banks of the Godavari. From Paithan on the Godavari the Satavahanas waged a holy war of *Dharma*. These were Andhras who were powerful from the second century B.C. to the third century A.D. After independence the Andhras looked back on their past with pride and their regional loyalty could not be satisfied until they got the Andhra State on linguistic basis. At this time the three Tamil kingdoms of the Chera, Chola and the Pandya sent out sailing vessels to South East Asia carrying Indian culture to Cambodia, Thailand and Indonesia. Later Orissa and Gujarat also traded with the countries of South East Asia.

A hundred years after the fall of the Kushans, Chandragupta I established in 319 A.D. the Empire of Guptas. His son Samudra Gupta (330-80 A.D.) was one of the most brilliant conquerors in history. In a whirlwind campaign he subdued most of the kings in a large part of the country. He restored *Dharma* in Aryavarta, and performed an *Asvamedha*. His younger son Chandragupta Vikramaditya (380-415 A.D.), the original Vikramaditya according to one view, annexed Western India and transferred the capital to Ujjain. It was during his reign that the great poet Kalidasa and several other scholars lived. India reached the pinnacle of glory under him. His son and grandson Kumara Gupta and Skanda Gupta (415-67 A.D.) maintained the empire and upheld *Dharma*. The age of the imperial Guptas is considered as the golden age of India, for there was a glorious revival of Hindu *Dharma*, art and literature. About 447 A.D. came the Huns and the Gupta Empire declined. In 500 A.D. Toramana, the Hun, occupied Malwa. Yasodharma of Malwa succeeded in rallying the national forces of Aryavarta and breaking the power of the Huns. It is said that the princes of all India from the Brahmaputra to the Western Ocean, from the Himalayas to Mount Mohendra laid their heads at his feet. After him there was a brief period of confusion.

In the first decade of the seventh century came Harsha to the throne of the imperial Kanauj. Soon he became the Emperor

North India. During his period there were two other powerful nperors, one in the Deccan and the other in South India. Pulaesin II, the Chalukya, inflicted a heavy defeat on Harsha who ıvaded the Deccan and came to be called the Lord of the outh. The river Narmada remained the boundary between the ominions of Harsha and Pulakesin II. The Pallava ruler of me, Narasimhavarman I (A.D. 630-68), was a great and powerıl ruler. He defeated Pulakesin II and invested his capital adami.

Mention should be made of the Sathavahana also known as alivahana, a dynasty of the Andhras who were in the service f the Mauryan empire in Western Deccan. The Sathavahanas ook advantage of the death of Asoka, organized an independent ingdom of their own and started it on a career of expansion. he greatest ruler of this line was Gautamiptra Satakarni, Lord f Western Vindhya (A.D. 80-104) who ruled over a vast territory xtending from the West Coast to the border of Kalinga on the ast. It is not clear how the rule of this dynasty came to an nd.

The Pallavas succeeded the Satavahanas and ruled for six enturies from about 275 A.D. It was in the time of the Pallavas hat the Sanskritic culture became prominent in South India. The rock-cut temples as in Mahabalipuram show the high tandard of sculpture and architecture reached by the Pallavas.

The next great ruler of India who revived the memories of Vikramaditya was Mihira Bhoja. He ruled the Empire of Gurjaradesa from 836 A.D. to 888. Bhoja conquered Sind and reconverted the people who under pressure of the Arabs had embraced Islam. He supported Brahmana Shati, the king of Kabul, in his fight against Islamic aggression. He held in check the Rashtrakuas in the South. His sway extended from the Punjab to East Bengal.

Between 1020 A.D. and 1044 there was another Bhoja who is regarded as one of the greatest emperors of the land. He was a poet, a patron of learning, a builder of great imagination, a conqueror and great philosopher. He belonged to the Paramara dynasty.

In South India the period 815 A.D. to 1200 witnessed the rise

of the Cholas to an imperial position. We have no place here for their frequent wars with Rashtrakutas and later with Chalukyas of Kalyani. The founder of the Chola dynasty was Vijayalaya who made Tanjore his capital. Rajaraja and Rajendra were the two greatest rulers of the dynasty. The great Brihadisvara temple at Tanjore was built by Rajaraja. Towards the close of his reign he conquered the Maldives. Rajendra who succeeded him maintained friendly relations with Sri Vijaya, the maritime empire of Sumatra. But his *digvijaya* across the seas led to a breach with Sri Vijaya. Rajendra's capture of the capital of Sri Vijaya (Palembang in Sumatra) and of Kadaram Keda on the west coast of Malaya was a great event. The kingdom was restored to the ruler on his acknowledging Chola suzerainty. The Cholas continued the Pallava tradition of temple architecture. The imperial age of the Cholas (850-1200 A.D.) was the golden age Tamil culture.

Hindu imperialism differs from other imperialisms in that the defeated monarch was allowed to rule as independent king if he respected the authority of the imperial power. The conquered people were not enslaved nor were they disturbed from their holdings. The Hindu kings could never be autocratic because they were governed by *Dharmasastra*. Those who defied the rules relating to *Danda* and *Niti* formed the exceptions. However, most Western writers characterize Hindu kings as absolute monarchs. Key industries and enterprises such as mines, forests, spinning and weaving were under state control. Irrigation works were all important. The assumption of Western historians is that the monopoly of water supply provided the basis for the absolutism of the monarch. However, the fact remains that Hindu kings were really less despotic than their contemporaries elsewhere.

During the confusion of the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries appeared the Western Ghats and the Rajputs. The latter were a military aristocracy who played the role of the ancient Kshatriyas. Through religious rites they became Kshatriyas. In their courage and chivalry they remained almost unmatched. They established a number of personal kingdoms in North India and had to bear the brunt of Muslim invasions in the eleventh

and twelfth centuries, but their utter lack of unity was largely responsible for the success of the Muslims in India.

The observance of Vedic rituals, common cultural traditions, places of pilgrimage in widely separated points in all directions in the country, the knowledge of the epics (*Ramayana* and *Mahabharata*) and the *puranas* that permeated the masses and the reliance of kings on their Brahmana advisers—all these aided the process of cultural unification of the peoples of India.

A.L. Basham's impression of the Hindu period is that "in no other part of the ancient world were the relations of man and man and of a man and the state so fair and humane. In no other civilization were slaves so few in number, and in no other ancient law-book are their rights so well protected as in *Arthasastra*." There is no doubt that the people of Hindu India enjoyed life. and delighted both in the things of the senses and the things of the spirit. The *rishis* of ancient times often were really human, men, full of joy of life. They had no pesimistic contempt for the good things of the world which later *rishis* and unorthodox religious leaders like Mahavira and Buddha have filled the Indian thought with.

The Hindu social system, in spite of the increasing rigour of caste system, reached a higher level of kindliness and gentleness in human relationship than any other contemporary society.

The Hindu achievement in religion, philosophy, art, literature and mathematics, particularly in the age of the Guptas, stands almost unequalled. Asceticism and the philosophical speculations of Sankara, Ramanuja, and Anandtirtha did turn people's minds towards ethical and moral values in life; but they did not rob the people of their joy in life because of their inherent capacity to rise above tradition in several respects. We shall in a separate chapter deal with the bases of Hindu society, namely the joint family, the caste system and the village community as the political unit.

2. OUTLINE OF MUSLIM RULE IN INDIA

(i) *The Sultanate of Delhi*

About the time that Harsha was ruling in India, there was a great upheaval in Arabia, owing to the teaching of Muhammad.

He claimed priesthood in his own right about A.D. 611 and began his reforming task with a zeal unparalleled in the history of the world. He adopted the faith of Islam which means peaceful acceptance of God and submitting oneself to His will. The two basic principles of the faith are: there is but one God and Muhammad is his apostle. In Muhammad the series of apostles reached its culmination, and "the Koran revealed through him final and unchangeable revelation of the Divine will abrogating all previous records of revelation".

The people of his native town Mecca opposed him and he escaped to Medena in A.D. 622 which begins the Islamic Era. He ultimately succeeded in winning over the townsmen of Mecca. Muhammad combined in his person priesthood and royalty and before his death in 632 it had become clear that Islam "involved the setting up of an independent community with its own system of government, laws and institutions". Islam recognized neither priesthood nor an organized church. Within ten years of Muhammad's death Syria, Iraq and Egypt embraced Islam and formed part of the Islamic Empire. With astonishing rapidity Islam expanded into Morocco, Spain and France, to the gates of Constantinople, far across Central Asia, and up to the Indus river. Early in the second decade of the eighth century Sind was conquered by the Arabs. The Hindu resistance prevented the further expansion of Islam in India. The Muslim incursions into India began again in the eleventh century A.D. after a lapse of nearly 300 years. It was not the Arab Muslims that came to India, but the Turks and the Afghans. Somehow or other the Arab energy appears to have declined in the tenth century. In Persia, the Arab nomads of the desert and the Turks, the nomads of the steppes, met. Thereafter Islam itself took a different turn, and it is even said that Islam was Iranized or Persianized. The cultural centre of Islam was Persia. The capital of the Islamic Empire became Bagadad not Mecca. The death of Muhammad resulted in a schism in Islam. The Muslims became divided into Sunni and Shia sects. The Sunnis cover about two-third of the Muslim population. For them the Khalif must be elected from among the members of Qurayish tribe, to which Muhammad the Prophet belonged. Shias who do not number more than

twelve million consider Ali (the Prophet's son-in-law) and his descendants as the only legitimate Khalifs. Besides these two broad divisions there are other sub-divisions among the Muslims to which reference will be made later.

History shows that the rise of Seljuks to power owing to the encouragement of the Khalif of Bagadad eventually brought about the downfall of Islam. They were rabid Sunnis employed to fight the Shiites and restore orthodox Islam. They were permitted to make Holy War. By the end of the eleventh century they built up an empire, which stretched from the Mediterranean to the Arab Sea and the Punjab. The Persians were not able to influence the Seljuks as they had done the Turks. The fanatic wars of the Seljuks and their establishment of feudal states led to the splitting up of the Islamic world into petty communities without contact with one another. At first Islam was able to overcome the Christian and Mazdean peoples with astonishing facility by its tolerance. But under the Seljuks this tolerance was replaced by the idea of the Holy War which brought about the struggle between Islam and Christendom. From the seventh to tenth century the empire of Bagadad by its contact with the West, India and the Far East had kept up a cosmopolitan civilization. But the Seljuk Empire raised an insuperable barrier between Europe and Asia. It is in this context that the Holy Wars in India and the appearance of the sea-faring West European nations in the Indian Ocean should be understood.

In the countries to which Islam was carried it was easily possible to make mass conversions more by force than by persuasion. No where did Islam meet with such stiff resistance as in India. The terror and persecution practised against the Hindus only aroused a passive resistance, which it was impossible for Islam to break. Hinduism not only remained impenetrable to Islam, but attained the highest intellectual development. Shankara raised the nation's thinking to the more absolute idealism than that of Plato and the other *acharyas* that followed effectively checked the spread of Islam. But it was Buddhism that suffered most. It became more and more relegated by its asceticism to the monastery. Beginning

to decay from the sixth century onwards, it almost disappeared from India with the death blow given to it by the Muslim conquest. But Brahmanical Hinduism which had never lost its influence among common people quickly recovered. No historian can fail to note that, alone of all the ancient religions, Hinduism survived the great waves of Buddhist, Christian and Islamic teachings. Hinduism is a synthetic religion, and it is capable of bringing about a synthesis of cultures. But Islam asserts that it is the only true religion in the world and that the others are false. So does Christianity. This has made it impossible for Hinduism to absorb either Islam or Christianity, although it did not fail to exercise some influence over them.

The so-called Muslim period of India falls into two main divisions which end and begin respectively with the year 1526. The first of these periods beginning roughly from A.D. 1001 is a long one characterized by continual ferment and confusion. Hindus and Muslims were in a state of uninterrupted and fierce struggle. Kingdoms were founded and overthrown; dynasties rose and fell. However, during the second period a greater stability prevailed and for more than three hundred years India was dominated by seventeen monarchs of the same dynasty, the Mughals.

The first period of rule passed through the hands of seven dynasties, namely, the Ghazni, the Ghori, the Slave, the Khilji, the Tughlak, the Sayyid and the Lodi. The Ghazni rule was confined to the Punjab. It was Jaipal, the prince of Lahore in the Punjab, that anticipated danger from the Lord of Ghazni and sought to reduce his rival's power by means of an incursion into Afghanistan, which ended in a friendly settlement. But soon the trouble arose. The iconoclast, Muhammad of Ghazni, whose fame rests more upon his religious fanaticism than upon his military achievements marched into India several times to plunder the enormous treasures which had been gathered in temples like Somanath. Famous poets and scholars adorned his court. Among them Alberuni, the historian, writes:

> ...the Hindus believe that there is no country like theirs, no nation like theirs, no kings like theirs, no religion like theirs,

no science like theirs. They are haughty, foolishly vain, self-conceited and stolid. They are by nature niggardly in communicating that which they know and they take the greatest possible care to withhold it from men of another caste among their own people, still much more, of course, from any foreigner.

This is the one side of Hindu nationalism as Alberuni saw it. In 1150 Ghazni fell into the hands of the House of Ghori. The Ghoris extended their supremacy over the whole lowland district of Northern India. The thrilling story of Prithviraj's fight against Muhammad Ghori has to be read elsewhere. While disunion and treachery among Hindu rulers in India cannot be ruled out, it must be pointed out that recent studies discredit the story of feud between Prithviraj and Jayachandra and the latter's invitation to Muhammad Ghori.

Under Kutab-ud-din, a slave who became king, the Indian territory of the Muslims became independent of Ghazni and Ghor. His territory extended to Vindhyas. It was during the period of the Slave Dynasty that the proud minaret Kutab Minar was raised in Old Delhi. All the slave princes were threatened by danger on three sides—from Hindus who were the more reluctant to submit to a foreign yoke in proportion to the pressure laid upon them by the fanatical Muslims, from the generals and governors who were attracted by the success which had attended the rise of the first slave princes and from the Mongols, whose devastating campaigns were continually and rapidly repeated after the first advance of Genghis Khan.

Mention must be made of Raziya, the only Muslim queen who reigned upon the throne of Hindustan (1236-39). She was a woman of masculine intellect, capable of shouldering the heavy responsibilities of her position. But, as Firishta says, her only fault was that she was a woman.

Alauddin Khilji was a ruler of some importance. He suppressed rebellions with great severity, warded off Mongol invasion and extended his sway far into the South, after capturing Devagiri. The history of the Deccan during the first century of Muslim rule in Northern India witnesses the struggles between the

Rajputs and the Hindu rulers of the South and the rise and fall of kingdoms such as Maharatta kingdom, the Eastern Chalukya in Andhra and the Western Chalukya in North-Western Deccan. To these must be added the kingdoms of Ganapati and Ballala and further to the south that of Mysore and the earlier kingdoms of Pandya, Chola and Chera.

In about two years Alauddin Khilji with the help of his favourite Malik Kafur was able to extend his power to Cape Comorin. This brilliant success in no way diminished the number of revolts caused by the Sultan's unpopularity.

The Mongols who had remained in India embraced Islam and took service in army, but in 1311 they were all put to death in consequence of a conspiracy. During the Khilji period of about thirty years, the Muslims adopted several Hindu customs and the Hindus began to conform to those of the ruling race. The influence of Hindu favourites of the Sultans was a factor in the history of the period. Under the Khilji, the Muslim power in India reached its first period of great prosperity. Then began the downfall.

Muhammad-bin Tughlak (1325-51) was perhaps the most striking figure of median Indian history. Really "he was a man of ideas and beyond his age", but as Elphinstone says: "His whole life was spent in pursuing visionary schemes, by means equally irrational and with a total disregard of sufferings which they occasioned to his subjects and its results were calamitous than those of any other reign." Next in importance is Firuz who acted with vigour and imagination. It is said that in his reign peasants grew rich and were satisfied. He abolished mutilation and torture as punishments for which he deserves unqualified praise. However, his resort to the system of *jagirs* which Alauddin Khilji had discountenanced cannot be defended. After Firuz the Sultanate practically ceased to exist and every province proclaimed its independence. One notable event of the period is the inroad of Timur who ordered a general massacre of the people of Delhi and saked the city for five days.

The Empire of Muhammad Tughlak had at one time included practically the whole continent of India with the exception of Kashmir, Cutch and a part of Kathiawar and Orissa. On the

death of his grand-nephew Muhammad, it extended only from Delhi to Palam, now the suburban airport of Delhi.

The Sayyids (1414-51) and the Lodis (1451-1526) held the Sultanate of Delhi till Baber the Mughal defeated Ibrahim Lodi and captured Delhi. In the days of Muhammad Tughlak a strong Hindu state was organized south of the Krishna River to offer a united front against Muslim advance. This was the kingdom of Vijayanagar. Its capital Vijayanagar was reported to be larger and more magnificent than even Rome. Until 1565 Vijayanagar successfully defended South India against Muslim conquest. During the time of Krishnadeva Raya, (1509-29) it was at the summit of its glory. North of Vijayanagar were the disrupted Muslim states of the Bhamani kingdom. In 1565 they united together against Vijayanagar, inflicted a crushing defeat and destroyed the capital. Vijayanagar (in Bellary district) even in its ruin shows the splendour of the city and the wonderful still of its sculptors.

The universal state or imperium is one of the characteristic features of almost all ancient civilizations. There is indeed a similarity in the concept of an imperialistic state between Islam and Hinduism. The concept of a single Pan Hindu Imperium was first brought into being in India by the martial energy of the Kshatriyas. It was symbolized by the *Asvamedha* and *Rajasuya* sacrifices. The idea was the establishment of *Dharma Rajya*, or kingdom of righteousness. There was no second political concept for the Hindu society of old. In the historical age, we find Hindu kings striving to establish a suzerainty stirred by the concept of a single Pan Hindu Imperium. These kings only partly succeeded in establishing an empire, but rivalries resulted in fierce civil war among the people. The Muslims too sought to establish their sway of the Islamic Universal State. The Khalifate constituted a theoretical embodiment of such a state. There was no alternative political thought for the Muslims too. But the theory of a Pan Islamic State took shape only after the historic Khalifate had decayed beyond recovery. While most nations have evoled politically from the smaller to the larger entity, that is from the city or tribe to the empire, the Islamic people have reversed the order. They began with a universal

state and came down to the competition of the disintegrated constituents. Legally the Sultanate of Delhi was a part of the Eastern Khalifate. The line of Khalifs in Bagadad came to an end in 1258; but even after that the Sultans of Delhi kept up the fiction of allegiance to the Khalif. There were of course a few exceptions. The convention was kept up till the Mughal conquest, when every dependent ruler became also the Khalif of his territory. Whatever the theory, the Sultan was practically an independent sovereign and the form of his government was despotic. In theory, however, the Sultan was subordinate to Muslim law (*Shar*) which he had to protect and enforce even as the Hindu king was subject to *Dharma*.

It must be said that Indian nationalism in the sense of resisting attacks on religion and culture began with the invasion of Muslims in India. The idea of protecting the land against foreign invasion was also there, but it was confined to the Kshatriya elements in the community, real or pseudo.

One thing that has engaged the attention of all the historians is to find the causes of the failure of the Hindus in stemming the tide of Muslim conquest. It must be observed first that the Muslims had no easy, swift and complete conquest of the country, as it happened elsewhere in the world. The Muslims were no doubt virile, particularly those that came from the North-West. Soldier to soldier, a Rajput, a Punjabi, or a Gujrati horseman was certainly a match for any Muslim soldier. The effects of climatic conditions on the mind and body are often exaggerated. It is often said that the caste system very largely weakened the Hindus in their resistance against the Muslims. This does not appear to be true, for those that were in the army were not all Kshatriyas. Nor could it be said that lack of unity among the Hindu rulers was a major cause for the defeat of the Hindus. Although the country was not under a single ruler, yet impelled by patriotism, the rulers combined to attack the invaders. The use of elephants in war is often pointed out as a cause of Hindu defeat. The elephants no doubt behaved badly at times, but their value as in instrument of destruction was recognized even by the invaders. In the absence of artillery in those days to threaten them off, it was not possible

to discard elephants altogether for purposes of warfare. The real causes of Muslim success appear to be the following: their horses were much better adapted to warfare than those of the Hindus. The Muslims were fired by their iconoclastic and missionary zeal and when they found that India did not yield much fruit in conversions, they grew pitiless. They believed that if they killed an infidel they would go straight to heaven. They knew that the temple fortresses contained hoarded treasure and attack on the temple would bring them rich reward. Moreover the Muslim practice then was to divide all the spoils of war among the soldiers, the commander retaining only one-fifth of the booty. Thus lust for gold and money was an incentive to the Muslims to fight with great severity. If the leader is either defeated or killed in the battle, the belief then was that the army lost the field. This had a psychological effect on the soldiers in the battlefield. After the death of the leader it was very rarely that a battle was carried on to a finish. The Muslims came to settle in India. They were in the midst of a hostile majority. As they had no homeland to go back to, their ferocity increased in proportion to the resistance of the Hindus.

The Muslim conquest of India was only a part of Islamic expansion and it brought India into intimate contact with the Islamic empire outside India.

(ii) *The Mughals*

The sixteenth century marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the world. For it was a period when the protestant nations of Western Europe successfully overcame the catholic sea power and broke the monopoly of the trade of Spain and Portugal. Nearly thirty years before Baber occupied Delhi, Vasco da Gama had landed on the West Coast of India and with in a few decades the trade across the India Ocean was wrested from the Arabs and Egyptians by th ePortuguese. The sixteenth century shows the introduction of two new elements in the history of India, the Mughals in the North and the Europeans in the South. The early half of the sixteenth century was a period of constant wars in the Deccan and South India, between Vijayanagar and the Bahmini Sultanates. The Portuguese allied themselves

with the Hindu king but their attempt at forceful conversion of the Hindus made them unpopular. The Protestant Dutch came as rivals and by their policy of noninterference in religion acquired popularity and almost drove the Portuguese out of Ceylon and the East Indies. The English who came after the Dutch, sought the patronage of the Muslim and from the start favoured the Muslims. The historian has to take note of that two types of Cultures, continental and maritime, started to affect the history of India from the beginning of the sixteenth century. We are now concerned with the continental empire founded by Baber.

By his mother Baber claimed descent from Genghiz Khan and on the paternal side Timur was his ancestor, in the fifth degree. Having lost his ancestral kingdoms of Farghana and Samarkand, he came to Kabul in 1504. When he failed in his attempt to recapture Samarkand he turned his attention to India. He crossed the Indus, and claimed the Punjab as his by virtue of Timur's conquest a hundred and twenty years before. Ibrahim Lodi met Baber at Panipat and suffered an ignoble defeat. Baber with his artillery was invincible. That was the time when Persia had greater regard for India than for Europe for her economic and intellectual life. Baber brought with him Persian culture. Baber occupied Delhi and Agra and distributed an enormous booty to the victorious army. He secured support of some Afghan Chiefs by a judicious mixture of firmness and cajolery. The Afghan chiefs who refused to submit to him made common cause with the Rajputs headed by Rana Sanga, who commanded a vast army. Rana Sanga was a doughty warrior who bore the scar of eighty wounds on his body, besides losing an eye, an arm and a leg in the war. Baber's army quailed before the prospect of the conflict with Rana Sanga. In 1527 Baber was fortunate in defeating Rana Sanga. He subdued the Afghan Chiefs of Bengal and Bihar and made himself master of a wide realm extending from the Oxus to the frontier of Bengal and from the Himalaya to Gwalior. In 1530 Baber took ill and died. Baber did not like India or its people. To him the chief excellency of Hindustan lay in its vastness and in its hoarded treasures. He frankly stated in his interesting autobiography that he could find no good food or bread and

no rice or cold water, no grapes or musk-melons in India. His memoirs contained the personal impressions and acute reflections of a cultivated man of the world, well read in Eastern literature.

Baber's son Humayun was twenty three years of age at his succession. Bengal was still unsubdued, and many of the Afghan nobles were still at large. His brothers to whom he was overgenerous gave him a lot of worry. Sher Khan, the Sur, inflicted a defeat on Humayun and Humayun had to run for his liberty and his life, being driven not by the Hindus, but by Muslims. It was on his way to Afghanistan that Akbar was born at Amarkot. The Persians were hospitable to him. He sought shelter under the Persian king and lived in exile for nearly fourteen years. Sher Khan who ruled only for five years was one of the ablest rulers that India had seen. His revenue system and postal system have won the admiration of historians. He died before he could establish his dynasty on the throne at Delhi. Within a few years after his death Humayun came back and took possession of Delhi. His stay in Persia helped him acquire love of literature, art and Persian way of life. Humayun, as Lanepool says, stumbled out of this world as he had stumbled into the kingdom. His son Akbar was only thirteen, and Bairamkhan, his regent, was an able general and statesman. Akbar's rule in India was contemporaneous with that of Elizabeth in England and the Mughal Empire in India was not less glorious than Elizabeth's in England. But Akbar's immense empire which extended over the Indus and Ganges basins and as far the Godavari in Central India was essentially a land state. The Sultans of Bijapur and Golkanda were forced to accept his suzerainty. It was a pity that Akbar was not interested in the sea. He accepted the situation of the Portuguese as an accomplished fact. He had no ambitions to take over the Hindu kingdoms of the South. During his time trade with foreign countries flourished. The absolutism of the Mughal Emperor was more complete than that of the Ottoman Sultan. All power and all justice was in the hands of the emperor. He was absolute owner of the whole land and was free to govern and impose tax as he pleased. The basis of the empire was the army. It had

200 thousand men and the best artillery managed by Europeans. There was a corps of 5,000 war elephants. But of Akbar it must be said that he did not want to be a despot. He took the advice of his able ministers like Todar Mal, Man Singh and Abul Fazl. He recognized that even with absolute power and an army manned by foreigners it was impossible to rule the country wisely, unless he made the state secular. He granted almost equal rights of citizenship to Muslims and non-Muslims. He deliberately improved the inferior status of Hindus by exempting them from the land tax imposed on non-believers. He followed a conciliatory policy towards Rajputs, and succeeded in winning over the Rajput princes except Rana Pratap Singh of Mewar. Being attracted by Brahmanic thinking and educated in Persian mysticism he tried to combine the essentials of Hinduism and Islam in his new religion called the Din-Ilahi. The emperor worshipped the Sun. He kindled in the palace a sacred fire never to be extinguished. But unfortunately the new religion found favour neither with the Hindus nor with the Muslims. Only a few adherents of Akbar followed it.

His court was splendid and the court manners were well regulated. European travellers have given splendid accounts in admiration of his court. Being surrounded by immense luxury Akbar needed evergrowing resources. With the help of Todar Mal, he had the land surveyed and taxes fixed. Land tax was fixed at one-third of the gross yield but soon it increased to a half. It must be said that Akbar did not succeed in relieving the poverty of the people. The administrative service set up for collection of taxes developed into a fiscal aristocracy which later became the instrument of oppression.

Akbar introduced into India the magnificence of Persian architecture and literature inspired by Persia. He was by far the wealthiest ruler in the world. The city of Fatehpur Sikri which Akbar laid out and built as his capital is an example of a combination of Hindu and Muslim conceptions. While the higher officials, except for a few, were Muslims, the lower bureaucracy predominantly remained Hindu.

Akbar left to his successors three essential lines of policy; maintenance of the national state, conciliation of the Hindus,

and unification of India. Akbar died in 1605 and his son Jahangir ascended the throne. Both he and his successor Shajahan maintained in some measure the first two principles of Akbar. It was only Aurangzeb, Shajahan's son, that deliberately violated all the principles of Akbar with disastrous consequences. All the Mughal rulers did their best to secure the unification of India but they did not succeed. Jahangir was an orthodox Muslim but he often visited Hindu religious men and showed them great respect. Akbar had introduced Persian as state language and in Jahangir's time Persianization of the court was more pronounced, particularly because of his wife Nurjahan, a Persian lady, who had very great influence on her husband.

Shajahan who succeeded Jahangir followed the Deccan policy of Akbar very vigorously, but the Deccan Sultanates united to resist Mughals. Shajahan started a campaign in the South and captured Doulat-a-bad. The Sultans of Bijapur and Golkonda still remained to be conquered. Golkonda accepted Mughal paramountcy, but Bijapur resisted for some time and then yielded. Shajahan was satisfied with the establishment of Mughal suzerainty in Deccan. But in his external possessions Shajahan was not successful. Shajahan was the greatest builder of the Mughal emperors. He was able to indulge in his zest for building, for he had enormous wealth at his disposal. The Taj Mahal at Agra and the Red Fort at Delhi are monumental examples of the magnificence of Shajahan's numerous buildings. His peacock throne whose beauty has been extolled by many foreign visitors was a wonder of the world. Shajahan was a zealous Muslim who destroyed a few Hindu temples, but he did not want to oppress his Hindu subjects. He firmly adhered to Akbar's policy of alliance with Rajputs. The number of Hindu officers under Shajahan greatly increased. He fully maintained the national character of the state, much to the dislike of his intriguing son, Aurangzeb.

Aurangzeb deposed his father and succeeded to the throne. He was perhaps the ablest of the Mughal rulers. He was a capable general and good administrator, who attended to details with meticulous care. But there was a change in his policy. He

meet Muslim challenge. When Aurangzeb was preoccupied in North, Shivaji became independent, and attempts to crush his power both by the Sultan of Bijapur and Emperor Aurangzeb failed. Further the Sikhs in the Punjab, followers of Guru Nanak (1469-1530) rose to power under Guru Govind Singh. Govind established the Khalsa and transformed the Sikh community into a military organization. When Aurangzeb died in 1707 he had raised against the Mughal rule the Maharattas in the South, the Sikhs in the North and had alienated completely the Rajputs. The Hindu population was no longer inclined to support the Mughals. Aurangzeb's attempt at the unification of India by the establishment of an Islamic state ended in a thorough failure, and decisively led to the downfall of the Mughal power in India.

The Maharatta armies made inroads into neighbouring territories to extract any tribute or plunder; Maharatta chiefs carved out a realm for themselves out of the weakening of the military power of the Muslims.

In 1724 the chief minister of the Mughal Empire became an independent ruler of the Deccan. He was the first Nizam of Hyderabad. The Mughal Empire broke up into small independent states. In 1739 Nadir Shah of Persia invaded the weakened Mughal Empire, defeated the imperial armies, plundered Delhi and carried off the Crown Jewels, including the famous peacock throne of Shajahan. Delhi was again subject to an invasion by Ahamed Shah Durani (1756). The Maharattas helped the Mughal Emperor against the Afghans. Maharatta power increased, but suddenly failed with the defeat at the third battle of Panipat (1761) at the hands of Shah Durani. Shah-Alam II, the Mughal Emperor during the last half of eighteenth century (1759-1806), was only a titular ruler; he became a pensioner controlled by one power or the other. He was under the Maharatta chief, Sindia of Gwalior, until in 1803 he came under the British control. The Mughal dynasty finally came to an end with the establishment of British rule in India.

3. BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

The Nature of the British conquest of India varies fundamen-

tally from that of the Muslims. The Muslim invaders settled within the frontiers of India and made themselves part of India's life, but their political leaders steadily cultivated separatist tendencies, and developed a 'two nation' theory which in 1947 culminated in the partition of the country into Pakistan and India. The Muslim conquest of India may be compared to the Norman conquest of England or the Manchu conquest of China, and it may reasonably be said that India did not lose her independence during the Muslim domination. The British conquest of India drew the country into a political and economic system whose centre of gravity lay in England thousands of miles away. From the time of their advent till their withdrawal in 1947, the British remained completely alien to India.

The British conquest of India was neither sudden nor accidental. The East India Company acquired experience and knowledge of the political, social and economic conditions of India for a period of 150 years before they decided to compete for primacy. In the middle of the eighteenth century, the political situation in India was bound up with European politics because of the rivalries among the West European nations. Portugal that had come to India earlier retained her monopolistic position till the end of the sixteenth century. The East India Company was formed in 1600 in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. By then the Dutch had superseded the Portuguese in the Indian waters. For a hundred years from 1650 to 1750 the Dutch were the most powerful, wealthiest and best organized of the European trading nations. When their naval power was broken, their commercial importance too declined. Consequently the East India Company had no other European rival except the French in India. France and England fought what is called the Seven Years' War, in which India and North America were at stake. The victory in this war made Britain supreme at sea so that all European powers were cut off and Britain was left alone to contest for power in India. The decay of the Mughal power plunged India into anarchy and greatly facilitated the British conquest. Jahangir allowed the establishment of a permanent English factory at Surat (1613). Within a few years the English were able to enter the Persian trade. In 1622 the Portuguese were completely

defeated in a sea fight. The English coveted the spice trade of the East Indies and came into conflict with the Dutch at Amboyna but were completely defeated. Never again did the English seriously challenge the position of the Dutch in the Malay Archipelago till Lord Minto's conquest of Java in 1811. After 'the massacre of Amboyna' the English concentrated their attention on trade with India. The beginnings of the British trade in Bengal were marked by factories at Balasore (1633) and at Hugli (1650-51). The chief articles of trade were saltpetre, silk and sugar. *In 1639* the East India Company got the grant of Madras from the Raja of Chandragiri. In return for the payment of a small quit rent the English were permitted to build a factory and exercise administrative authority over the town. Gradually the Company got power to build and maintain fortresses, raise armies and maintain naval units, coin money and to administer justice. Bombay which Charles II had received as a part of his Portuguese bride's dowry was given away to the Company on a small rent of £ 10 a-year. Bombay replaced Surat as headquarters of the Company in May 1687. From the report of Sir Josiah Child, a prominent member of the directorate of the Company, it is clear that the Company hoped for a "sure English dominion in India for all time to come". The Company got Kalighat which later developed into Calcutta. In 1700 Bengal became a separate charge under a president and council at Fort William. With the three presidency towns of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras as bases the Company, started in its career of building up an empire in India.

In the later half of the eighteenth century, the English were the strongest power in the Indian waters and needed only an accession to territory to launch them on an imperial career in India. The French who were at Pondicherry took the first step by interfering in the internal politics of India. In 1746 during the war of Austrian Succession they seized Madras but had to return it to the English according to the terms of treaty which ended the war. The death of the Nizam of Hyderabad gave the English and the French an opportunity to interfere in Indian affairs. The French supported one contender and the English another. It was at this time that Clive rose from the

position of a humble clerk to that of a military leader by capturing and occupying Arcot, the undefended capital of the Carnatic. The English got the better of the French in the Carnatic wars.

The British in Calcutta had trouble with the Nawab of Bengal who seized Calcutta. Clive and Watson were sent for the relief of the English. The result was the battle of Plassey in 1757. Clive contrived to defeat Siraj-ud-daula by intrigue with Mirjafar, the Chief Commander of the Nawab. The victory at Plassey was the starting point of British conquest in India. At that time Bengal was very wealthy and Clive made an immense fortune. Seven years after Plassey the British precipitated a war against Mir Kasim, an intelligent and capable Nawab of Bengal. In the Battle of Buxar in 1764 the Nawab was defeated. This victory made the British almost supreme in North India. The helpless and powerless Mughal Emperor gave the British the right to collect revenues in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.

For nearly fifteen years after the battle of Plassey the Company's servants indulged in a greedy scramble for wealth. They took bribes from Indians and cared more for their private trade than for that of the Company. According to the Regulating Act of 1773 when for the first time the Parliament asserted its right to regulate the Company, Warren Hastings, an oriental scholar, became the Governor-General of Bengal. He laid the foundation of the Britsh rule in India. His methods of acquiring resources for his wars were not above board. Lord Cornwallis who succeeded him as the Governor-General from 1786-93 did his best to put an end to the corruption among the Company's officials. He established a distinction between the administrative and commercial functions of the Company. He organized a separate civil service to administer the territory. This was called a covenanted service, in which the civil servants had to promise not to engage in trade, but Indians were scrupulously excluded from higer posts of Government.

In 1765 the Nawab of Oudh came under the protection of the British. The real rivals for primacy in India were the Maharattas and the Sultan of Mysore. Hyder Ali was a soldier of fortune, who built up a Muslim kingdom in Mysore. He was a great diplomat and realized that it was impossible for him

to meet the British at sea. His son Tippu was a young, energetic and ambitious ruler. He established contact with the French and with the Shah of Kabul. At that time Napoleon was rising into prominence. The Maharattas were really a power to be reckoned with, but it was fortunate for the British that the Maharatta states and dynasties were plunged by a series of deaths into a state of faction and rivalries which effectively prevented a concentrated action against the threatening Birtish power.

Those were the days when the directors of the East India Company at home did not favour the policy of British expansion as it involved heavy expenditure in wars inevitably reducing trade dividends. By the Act of 1784 the Governor-General was not "to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India or measures repugnant to the wish, honour and policy of this nation". The East India Company was forbidden to declare war or enter into treaties without specific permission of the Board of Control. Lord Wellesley, Governor-General from 1798 to 1805, pursued a policy of aggression and expansion. He had an insatiable thirst for honour and an inexcusable contempt for Indians. The presence of Napoleon in Egypt afforded Wellesley a pretext to follow his policy of aggression. The Nizam of Hyderabad was hedged in between two powerful rivals, the Maharattas in the North and Tippu Sultan in the South. While the Nizam accepted nominally the suzerainty of the emperor at Delhi, Tippu claimed to be independent of the Mughal power. Fear of his enemies drove the Nizam to accept the protection of the British. Wellesley thrust on him the system of subsidiary alliance by which the Nizam agreed to have a British army at his expense in his territory. He agreed also not to make war or peace with any other power and to have a British resident stationed in his capital whose advice he had to take. Thus the Nizam became a vassal of the British. Wellesley was not the man to wait for a war to be sanctioned by the Board of Control. When Tippu refused to agree to the subsidiary alliance, Wellesley launched an attack on Mysore. In 1799 Tippu was killed in battle at Srirangapatam. The coastal areas of Mysore were annexed by the British. The Nizam was given a portion of the territory. The

rest of Mysore was handed over to a five-year old Hindu prince. With the subjugation of Tippu only the Maharattas remained. The Peshwa who was the real ruler of the Maharattas was in trouble. Wellesley persuaded him to accept the subsidiary aliance. In 1802 the Peshwa accepted the Company's protection. The Maharatta chiefs made war on the British. The British campaigns during 1803-04 against Sindia were successful. The Mughal Emperor who had been under Sindia now placed himself in British hands. He was allowed to retain his empty title and his sovereignty did not extend beyond Red Fort in Delhi. So long as he was successful Wellesley's disregard of directions from England was tolerated. But when there was a clear defeat Wellesley was recalled. When Wellesley left India he had made conquests vaster than those of Napoleon, closed India to the French, destroyed the Muslim power of Mysore, dethroned the dynasties of Surat, Carnatic and Tanjore, dismembered the states of Oudh, the Nizam, the Peshwa, Bhonsle, Sindia and Holkar, doubled the extent of the Company's territory, linked up Madras with Bengal, taken the Mughal emperor under the Company's protection and put into practice the theory of English suzerainty over Indian princes.

After Wellesley there was a lull in the expansionist policy of the British for eight years. Lord Hastings (1813-18) effectively put down the Maharatta power, spread British control across Central India so that the three ports of Madras, Bombay and Calcutta became linked together in British territory. Thus British power in India extended over the whole of India except in Punjab, Sind and Himalayan states. Lord Hastings succeeded in getting hill stations from the Nepalese territoy like Simla and Nainital. The next Governor-General of importance was Lord William Bentinck (1828-35). It was during his period that the momentous decision of making English the official language was taken. A resolution of the Governor-General-in-Council 7 March 1835 said: "the great object of the British government ought to be promotion of European literature and science among the people of India and that the fund appropriated to education would be best employed on English education alone." William Bentinck's administration was peaceful except for the annexation of Coorg.

Lord Auckland carried out instructions he received from home in respect of a war with Afghanistan which ended in disaster. The Russian bogey acted on the nerves of the British authorities in India and to keep Afghanistan as a buffer state was the policy of the British. Ellenborough (1842-44) who succeeded Auckland was a man of vigour. He too suffered reverses in his Afghan war. But the failure in Afghanistan was compensated by the conquest of Sind, an act which Napier describes "as a humane piece of rascality". Ellenborough succeeded in bringing Gwalior under British rule, but the Board of Directors, alarmed at the arrogant tone of his correspondence, recalled him. Hardinge (1844-48) succeeded in defeating the Sikhs. The English got Kashmir which they put into the hands of a subservient Hindu ruler.

Next to Wellesley it was Lord Dalhousie who followed the policy of expansion and consolidation of the British Empire in India successfully. He sincerely believed that it was necessary to annex Indian territories and bring them under British power for the establishment of peace in India and had no compunction in annexing the Punjab. By his energetic action he brought Burma under the British rule. With regard to the succession of Hindu states in India, he used his powers of paramount authority in accepting or rejecting adoption. He followed the instructions of the Board of Directors that adoption "could never be granted but as a special mark of favour and approbation," on the ground that if a prince died without heir his kingdom lapsed to the paramount state. Dalhousie annexed Satara, Sambalpore and Jhansi. The honour of Royalty was denied to the successors to the Nawab of Carnatic and the Raja of Tanjore. The greatest annexation was that of the Maharatta kingdom of Nagpur. When he annexed Nagpur he said: "I conscientiously declare that unless I believed that the prosperity and happiness of its inhabitants would be promoted by their being placed under British rule, no other advantages which could arise out of the measure would move me to propose it." Berar of the Nizam territory was annexed for arrears of rent. On the eve of his departure Dalhousie annexed Oudh on the score of misgovernment. Impartial British historians have condemned it as an act

of injustice. It was during Dalhousie's time that the system of communication by railway was introduced. His idea was to attract private enterprise by European capitalists who would be safeguarded by government guarantee. Along with railways went the construction of the telegraph and the introduction of the cheap half anna postal system. The Department of Public Works was reconstructed in his time. That was a period when England was growing into the workshop of the world as a result of the industrial revolution. Sir Willson Hunter summing up the results of Dalhousie's administration in India says:

> During his eight years of rule the export of raw cotton more than doubled itself, from one and a half million pounds to close on three millions and one-third. The export of grain multiplied by more than three-fold from £890,000 in 1848 to £2,900,000 in 1856. Not only was the export of the old staples enormously increased, but new articles of commerce poured into the markets, under the influence of improved internal communications and open ports. The total exports of merchandise rose from 13½ millions sterling in 1848 to over 23 millions in 1856. The vast increase of productive industry represented by these figures, enabled the Indian population to purchase the manufactures of England on an unprecedented scale. The imports of cotton goods and twist into India rose from three million sterling in 1848 to 6⅓ millions in 1856. The total imports of merchandise and treasure increased during the eight years from 10½ to 25¼ millions.

Hunter's intention is to show the commercial prosperity of India, but it is clear that India which had been exporting manufactured goods had by 1856 turned into a country importing manufactured goods and exporting only raw products. By 1857 the East India Company was in complete control of India, ruling about three-fifth of the country directly and remaining two-fifth indirectly through subservient Indian princes. The cumulative effect of Dalhousie's administration was the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 which the nationalists call the First war of Indian Independence. The discrimination of the treatment between sepoys and British soldiers, insistence on overseas service which offended the religious feelings of high caste men in the army, the uneasy restless-

ness among the civil population, widespread unemployment caused by numerous escheats and annexation, the protection of the civil rights of converts from Hinduism to Christianity by *means of legislation and finally introduction of* greased cartridges made the sepoys of Northern India rise in revolt against the British. The trouble began at Meerut, thirty miles north of Delhi. The Sepoys refused to use the greased cartridges and they were court-martialled. This aggravated the situation. The Sepoy revolt spread to Delhi, Kanpur, Lucknow and other places. The powerless Mughal Emperor was made the leader. Hindus and Muslims joined the fight. This was confined only to North India. The Punjab and South India remained untouched by the revolt. The sepoys behaved savagely towards the British men and women. The revolt was put down with great difficulty after a year of hard fighting. Royal British troops were rushed from England to put down the revolt. Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi and Nana Sahib and Tantia Topi distinguished themselves for their heroism in the fight against the British. The British suppression of the revolt was as violent and shameful as the Indian sepoys' inauguration of it. The Indian princes were careful not to give room for any suspicion that they supported the revolt of the sepoys. The Mutiny left bitter memories and created a social estrangement between the English and the Indians. This had a reaction on political relations as well. The British administrators distrusted the Indians and were unwilling to promote them to positions of responsibility. They were definitely disinclined to interfere in questions of religion or caste. The Indians on their side developed a more critical attitude towards the achievements of the West and showed a marked tendency to glorify India's past. This Mutiny of 1857 gave the British Government an excuse for formally taking over the Government of India directly under Parliamentary authority. The Queen of England became the Empress of India in 1858.

Queen Victoria in her proclamation in 1858 promised religious tolerance declaring that race or creed would be no bar to office under the crown, renounced the doctrine of lapse, and assured the Indian princes that the suzerain power would not interfere in their internal government except to correct serious abuses. From 1858

to 1947 India was ruled by twenty-one Viceroys, who were also Governor Generals.

An independent India Council of prominent officials was created in 1858. It was invested with full powers over Indian administration. In actual practice, however, the Secretary of State became the chief person both to the India Council and the Parliament. The Governor General was assisted by an Executive Council in administration and matters of policy. An India Councils Act of 1892 introduced some changes in the composition of the Council. The members of the Viceroy's Council consisted of a few elected Indian members and they were allowed to ask questions and discuss the budget. The Indian National Congress founded in 1885 represented the educated class and demanded for them a share in the administration of the country. In 1909 came the Minto-Morley Reforms. The number of additional members of the Viceroy's Council was increased to sixty at the centre and from twenty to fifty in the Provincial Councils. In the provinces non-official members were in a majority but at the centre majority of official members were kept in tact. Communal representation was brought into effect in election to the legislature. These reforms, however, did not satisfy the people. Then came the great war of 1914-18, which brought about a radical change in the British policy. The agitation for political rights among the Indians increased. In August 1917 the goal of British policy in India was announced to be "the progressive realization of responsible government". The Government of India Act of 1919 introduced the 'diarchy' as a transitional stage. Subjects such as law and order and revenue were placed under executive members of the Governor-in-Council. Education and local self-government and such others were transferred to ministers. The diarchy did not work satisfactorily, but this continued until the Government of India Act of 1935. The Congress kept up its agitation for self-government. We will revert to this subject when we deal with the struggle for independence.

4. ESTIMATE OF THE THREE PHASES

The coming of the Aryans about the middle of the second millennium B.C. may be regarded as the beginning of the first phase

of Indian history, conventionally called Hindu Period, which is also called Indo-Aryan. It would, however, be truer to say that the beginning of the period cannot accurately be dated. The Harappa civilization lies below the horizon of historical knowledge and its relationship to the Aryan civilization is still a matter of conjecture. The end of the Hindu period may be dated A.D. 1192, when Muhammad of Ghor defeated Prithviraj. The second, the Indo-Islamic period may be taken as ending with the battle of Plassey in 1757. Thus the so-called Muslim period lasted for 565 years. The British period began in the middle of eighteenth century. Although the British rule was formally terminated on 15 August 1947, India is still in a period of transition. The dominant culture of each of these three period varies considerably, but there is an underlying unity in the history of India. In the first period India used Sanskrit along with Prakrits, in the second Persian together with Indian vernaculars such as Urdu and Hindi and in the third English with modern Indian languages. The linguistic difference is no evidence of discontinuity in the cultural trend of India.

While there has been an increase in the field of politics from period to period, there has been a decrease in equality in the field of culture. By far the most original and massive was the Indo-Aryan period which with its *Vedas, Upanishads, Ithihasas, Puranas* and *Dharmasastras* built up a society, the fundamental principles of which survive to this day. The *Arthasastra* in Sanskrit shows the development of political science which was a special favourite among scholars from some centuries before the Christian era. The Mauryan Empire, the Gupta Empire and the Vardhana Empire show a progress in Indian politics, art and literature.

The Islamic period, though magnificent in point of architecture and remarkable in its unified political structure, was certainly on a lower plane culturally than that of the first. The culture of the British period in spite of all that is said about scientific inventions and technological devices must be regarded as the least solid of the three. Garrat in his Essay on Indo-British civilization says :

It might have been expected that Indian philosophy, literature, and art would have received at last a fuller appreciation in Europe; and that some new form of civilization might have developed from the close contact between England and India. Unfortunately it must be confessed that the last 150 years have proved the most disappointing, and in some ways the most sterile in Indian history. The English, working or domiciled in India, have not provided a good channel for spreading abroad the more valuable elements of Indian culture. Even more surprising is the poverty of harvest from this hybrid civilization, from Indians working under English influence, or from English inspired by India and the Indian peoples.

The failure is attributed to conditions of European colonization in which Britishers regarded India as a temporary place of living for exercising power and making money. The British neglect of the Indian craftsmanship is ascribed partly to the policy of the British Government and "to the ignorance of hubristic outlook of the expatriated Englishman". The sterility of Indian science and art is also attributed to the same causes. The greatest contribution of Britain to India is the English language which serves as the medium of communication between India and the materially advanced West. Representative government of the parliamentary type and the judicial procedure in courts of law are other British contributions of inestimable value.

In the first phase, the extent to which the Aryan and pre-Aryan cultures acted on each other does not admit of a very clear definition. The priests and warriors were separated from the bulk of the people in social matters. In the age of the *mantras* the Brahmin priesthood worked out an elaborate sacrificial ritual which was accepted by the society. These rituals were based on the *Vedas*. Notable among the reactions to the sacrifices and rituals is rise and spread of Buddhism. The South was never conquered by the Aryan military forces, but the religious beliefs and sacrificial rituals evolved in the Ganges valley slowly penetrated the whole of the Dravidian society. The South assimilated the modes of thought and political institutions of the Aryans,

recognized Sanskrit as a sacred language and accepted the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*. Buddhism and Jainism were also popular in the South, but the Vedic religion remained unaffected by them. In consequence a homogeneous Hindu culture came to be established throughout India. This took a final shape and reached its peak between the fifth and twelfth centuries of the Christian era. The bases of the social system such as the joint family, caste system and self-sufficiency of the village will be dealt with separately later.

In the Indo-Islamic period, bands of Turkish, Arab and Afghan adventurers made intermittent raids in search of money and slaves throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In 1206 the Delhi Sultanate was founded as an independent Muslim state. There was no change in the social and economic foundations of Indian life, although there were conversions chiefly because of the desire of the poor people to escape from the Poll tax, levied on all non-Muslims. In this period Arabic and Persian languages were brought into India. The Muslim law was introduced and a new ruling class was formed. The Afghan rule in India was maintained with the help of military force. The new element in the Indian population, namely the Hindu converts to Islam, resisted absorption. Hinduism could not reabsorb them, but continued to be tolerant. The Muslims and the Hindus did not live in a state of hostility. No doubt there was savage persecution of the Hindus in the beginning, but necessity of administration made the Muslim rulers take into service Hindus in the lower ranks. The Muslims too learned the virtue of tolerance. Except under a fanatic rule, the Hindus lived unmolested. After a generation or two the Muslims ceased to be foreign and developed social intercourse with the Hindus. The Muslim rulers were not less ferocious to their co-religionists who stood in their way than they were to the Hindus and Muslims, who learned to live in amity, particularly in rural areas.

The most brilliant period in the history of the Muslim rule was that of the Mughals who patronized art, music, painting, poetry and architecture. There was a cultural renaissance in the period which was rudely shaken by the bigotry of Aurangzeb.

The Muslim architecture owed not a little to the earlier Hindu design. Hindu craftsmen contributed to the magnificence of Muslim architecture.

The Muslim period shows many writers, saints, and scholars and administrators. Ramanuja in the later half of the eleventh century wrote commentaries on the ancient texts and led a crusade for *Bhakti marga.* He threw open the temple of Melkote for a day in the year to the untouchables. Sage Vidyaranya made Harihara and Bukka renounce Islam and return to the Hindu fold. He helped them found the city of Vijayanager. The celebrated Vedic commentator Sayana (died 1387) was the minister of Harihara II. Basava of the twelfth century, a minister of the Jain king at Kalyan, was a great social reformer, who spread the Lingayat movement. He worked for the emancipation of women and the enrichment of Kannada. Among the great names of mediaeval Indian poets that of Kabir (1398-1448) is prominent. It cannot be said with certainty whether he was born a Hindu or a Muslim. He was greatly influenced by Ramananda. Kabir was against image worship, pilgrimage and fasts. His teachings had a tremendous influence on Hindus and Muslims. Nanak was another mystic saint of this period. He was born in 1469 in the Punjab. He travelled up and down the country—Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. It is said that he also visited Mecca and Baghdad. He founded the Sikh religion and attempted to unite the Hindus and Muslims. Chaitanya in Bengal (1485-1533) had a strong hold over the minds of the people. He was a devotee of Krishna and his cult of *Bhakti* spread to Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa. Tulsidas is an outstanding example of a man of letters. His memorable *Rama Charitamanas* or *Tulsi Ramayana* continues to be admired by the Indians. As it is in a form of Hindi, the language of the masses, it is greatly appreciated. But unlike Kabir and Nanak, Tulsidas preaches the cult of formal religion. Tukaram (1608-49) in Maharashtra was another religious reformer. Earlier, Nayanmars and Alwars in the South spread the *Bhakti* cult. It is said that the *Bhakti* movement served as a way of escape from the depressed feelings caused by the Islamic oppression. But *Bhakti* movement is only an extension of the old *Bhagavata* movement.

Social and religious reformers did of course attempt to narrow down the gulf between Islam and Hinduism and promote brotherliness among the peoples through the *Bhakti* cult.

The third phase of Indian history is dominated by the political and economic conditions created by the industrial revolution. India was primarily a field for economic exploitation and for the provision of sinecure posts for the nobility of Britain. Politically India became a single unit in this period. The British were fortunate in getting Indian money and Indian men not only to fight their wars, but also to maintain their dominion in India. The presence of a large number of mercenary soldiers who were willing to take up service under anybody who could pay them, shows the poverty of the people as well as their lack of a spirit of nationalism. At the time when the British came to India, the country was comparatively rich, but gradually its economic position weakened because of the heavy military expenditure, the top-heavy administration and the mercantile policy of the British.

Both in the Indo-Islamic and the British periods there arose a new middle class. This consisted of educated men who made their living by taking up service under the government. It also consisted of merchants and traders who made themselves rich. The educated middle class was in a way cut off from the masses of the people. It was thoroughly subordinate to the ruling class, Muslim or British. This was certainly an influential section of the community although subservient to the ruling class. In the Muslim period there were jagirdars who held large tracts of land for the military service they had to render to the rulers. During the British rule a new class of zamindars and jagirdars came up, and they were free to tax the tenants so long as they paid the stipulated amount to the government. The mass of the people did not very much concern themselves with the affairs of the government so long as they were free to follow their traditional occupations. Most of the Muslims were of the same blood as the Hindus, although they differed in religious pursuits. There was never, therefore, a racial conflict in India during the Muslim period. Racial differences became prominent only during the British period. At first

the Company's servants did try to adjust themselves to the new situation in India and to live the same kind of life as the Indians with whom they came in contact. But when the covenanted civil service and later the Indian civil service came, the officials looked down upon the Indians and behaved as if they were far superior to the Indian subject. As they remained in isolation, there was no social intercourse between them and the Indians. Even in the clubs they established, Indians were prevented from entering. Throughout the British period the consciousness of a race barrier was ingrained and there was a sense of race inequality which roused among Indians resentment against the idea of subordination to the Europeans. One notable feature of the period was the growth of prose literature in the Indian languages and this is considered as mark of modern civilization.

In the Muslim as well as the British period there was a steady destruction of exclusive privilege of certain sections of the Hindu community. The very poor and down-trodden became Muslims and grew to be one-fifth of the population. Christianity too drew a small number of the socially oppressed mostly attracted by the opportunities for economic improvement. So long as the masses of Muslims remained unsophisticated there was no fear of any communal outbreak. But in the nineteenth century, there was a resuscitation of the Hindu past which brought about a tremendous revival of Hindu traditions. As a reaction to this there was a continuous attempt on the part of the Ulema and Muslim politicians to complete the Islamization of the Muslims qualitatively and increase their number by proselytization. The British policy was to exploit the differences between Hindus and Muslims so as to strengthen and perpetuate their hold on India. By favouring Muslims in recruitment to the military and civil services and bringing about separate communal electorates, the British Government saw to it that the Hindus and Muslims did not amalgamate. The group consciousness of the two communities remembers more the differences in religion than cultural similarities. The Hindu-Muslim problem assumed greater and greater dimension and the country had to be partitioned at the time of the withdrawal of Britain from India. The European affiliation of India has continued

unabated after independence in 1947. India is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, whose leadership is in the hands of Britain.

CHAPTER FOUR

Traditionalism and Modernism

DOUBTS entertained by most Western writers as to whether India is safely in the camp of democracy, whether science and technology are compatible with traditional values in Indian life and whether India can be assured of increasing prosperity are chiefly because of inadequate recognition of India's attempt, throughout the ages, at a reconciliation of the opposing forces of enjoyment and renunciation. There are also misconceptions regarding the three pillars of the Indian social structure namely the joint family, the caste and self-sufficient village community. In this chapter we shall deal with the trends in different aspects of Indian life to help the reader get a proper perspective of the Indian society and visualize its future.

1. JOINT FAMILY

Let us take up the joint family first. In all societies the family is the unit. Some families are patriarchal and some matriarchal. Both the types are found in India. The latter is found largely on the west coast of South India, but the former is the commoner. In olden days it was usual for all the members of a family, sometimes numbering more than fifty, to live together. The head of the family was usually the father and after him the eldest male member of the family took his place. The property was held in trust by the head of the family, and the other members had a share in the produce of the land. The earnings of the members were also pooled by the head of the family, and each member was given a share according to his needs. The head of the family was the law giver and the other members usually obeyed his will. Sometimes the family would include some members unable to earn on account of their physical or mental disabilities. Helpless widows formed part of the family. It was a point of pride with every member of the joint family to subordinate himself or herself to the larger interests of the family group. Each member of the group sought to maintain the tradition and honour of the family. Women were respected and had an important role to play in family affairs.

This joint family system remained unimpaired till the end of the nineteenth century, when ideas of individualism began to affect Indian society in general. Paradoxical as it may seem, religious thought and spiritual teaching in India have always emphasized the individual while the social tendency has been to subordinate the individual to the claims of group and society. In this joint family system some useless mouths had to be fed. The critic says that it promoted indolence among the less able members and led to a lack of incentive in the energetic members of the family to greater effort and there is some truth in this. The social and economic value of the joint family cannot, however, be underestimated. That there are practically no Hindu orphanages shows the cooperativeness and cohesiveness of the joint family system. Helpless members even remotely connected to the family were supported.

History shows that civilization advances parallel with the realization of the value of the individual progress. Individualism and progress seem to be inseparable concomitants. The family is a part of the framework of the society. The individual lives as a member of the family in this framework. For the development of the personality of the individual he has to collaborate with his peers.

The criticism levelled against the joint family is that it deprives the individual of his liberty. The individual has liberty only to a limited extent. Western society stresses more the rights of the individual, while the Indian society stresses more his duties. It is observed that in India the individual's obligation to the society is generally less realized than his obligations to the family or group to which he belongs. There must be a balance between the rights of the individual and his obligations to society or group. When the balance breaks down to the benefit of the individual, individualism becomes egocentric and destructive. If in a country the mass of the people are crushed by power of money, it means that individual liberty has set up an economic dogma which rejects social morality. For example, economic liberalism of the later half of the nineteenth century promoted democracy but in the twentieth century it became antithetical to democracy due to concentration of economic power in the hands of a few.

The impact of individualism was felt in India only towards the close of the nineteenth century. The break-up of the joint family is due to several causes. For education youngmen and women have to separate themselves from family to live in university centres. Occupation often forces the members of the family to live separately in distant places. Legislative reform has led to the division of property among the members of the family. Sometimes lack of adjustment compels couples to break away from the joint family. At present only less than twenty per cent of the families continue to remain as joint families in India. The ancestors of those who are now Muslims lived in joint families before Islam was founded. Muslim families continue to be joint patriarchal families. The head of the family or his substitute is always entitled to respect from

the other members of the family.

In Hindu families marriages are generally settled by the eldest member in the family, though separated by distance. The modern practice is to allow the prospective couple to see each other and give their consent for the marriage. However, marriages where the couple see each other only at the time of the bridal ceremony are still not uncommon. Though for social and economic reasons joint families have been disrupted, still the emotional ties continue to operate. Important decisions such as marriages or disposal of property are taken by the head of the family. The Land Ceiling Act[1] has resulted in the division of property among the members of the joint family. The joint family in spite of its defects has some good in it. Young children living in a joint family develop a group consciousness and show greater cooperativeness and spirit of self-sacrifice. The cohesiveness of the joint family which led to the solidarity of the society is now a vanishing landmark in India.

2. THE CASTE

After the large joint family the caste was an institution that provided social security.

Vedic scriptures repeatedly declare that the soul has no creed, caste, colour, race or sex. Although in Vedic times the caste system is not found, the groundwork for its later development is present in Rig Veda. The distinction between holy power *Brahma*, kingly power *Kshatra*, and the commonality *Vis* is a matter of common knowledge. In the Purusha Sukta in the tenth book of the Rig Veda the name Sudra appears. This is perhaps the name of some prominent Dasa tribal leader.

That human society should be organized and individual life should be planned so that each may know his duties and rights in a given situation and satisfy his spiritual and material needs as best he may is recognized by all. There will, of course, be differences with regard to how it should all be done. In spite

[1] The principle that there should be a ceiling on land holdings was accepted in the First Plan (1950-51, 1955-56). The provisions of the Act have been enforced in all states.

of the abuse heaped on Manu, the Hindu Law giver, by some ill-informed Western writers, there are still some thinkers who regard that Manu's Scheme of Individuo-Social Organization is the best available scheme of human planning. The caste system, a peculiar feature of Indian society, is denoted by two terms *Varna* and *Jati*. *Varna* literally means colour, not race; it implies also character, nature and quality. *Jati* is interpreted as the form of existence fixed by birth. According to the *Varna* theory the position of a man in society is determined by the nature and quality of the occupation he follows. Those who hold to this theory assert that *Varna* does not mean a separate 'birth-caste'. "The impress of its original and etymological sense is proved by the fact that a very large number of Caste-names are names of occupation."[2] One may change one's occupation and consequently one's social position will also change. The *Jati* theory maintains that a man's position in society is determined by providence which represents the sum total of his actions done in his previous births and hence the social status is a fixed one, whatever avocation he may follow in his present life. The conflict of these two theories has been going on from the ancient period to the present day.

The Sanskrit names of the four component parts of the Indian society are (*a*) *brahmana* (the priest) (*b*) *kshatriya* (the warrior) (*c*) *vaisya* (the trader) and (*d*) *sudra* (the labourer). One point that has not received adequate attention in the discussions relating to class or caste divisions in society is that the first three main types "with that fourth residual plasmic type, are to be found in all grades of communities of human beings; primitive, barbarous, 'semi-civilized'; as well as those which regard themselves as very advanced and very highly civilized". There are Islamic Arabic-Persian names corresponding to the names of the four *varnas*.[3] In Britain they used to speak of the three estates of the realm (*a*) clergy (*b*) nobility (*c*) commons to which a fourth may be added now (*d*) proletariat. Other countries and languages of Europe have corresponding classes

[2] Bhagvan Das.

[3] (*a*) *Ul-ni-ilm, also ul-ulilbhach* (*b*) *ul-ul-amr* (*c*) *zurra* (*d*) *mnzd-war*; the first three occur in the *Quran*.

and words. In England the institution of monarchy is a standing example of succession by heridity. Edward VIII had to abdicate to live with a wife of his choice. Even now there are families in England that feel proud of tracing their descent to some Norman Baron and claim comparatively high social status.

A description of how and why the different sections of society were intended to work together is found in the Bible: "There are many members, yet one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you....And whether one member suffers, all the members suffer with it."

Dealing with "The Basic Natural Laws that Govern Man's Material Welfare" two American writers[4] say that "no two human beings are equal in all respects and that no nation can make genuine lasting progress without recognizing and utilizing the Law of unequal talents and that this is evidenced by the recognition of the need for unequal rewards". When such is the case in the sphere of material welfare, how much more would inequality be in the realm of spiritual development. The U.S.S.R. too recognizes the law of inequality and pays fabulous premiums to specially talented people. "The 20th Century cult of artificial equality between unequal men, crazy as it is, has gained enormous popular acceptance."

The *varnasramadharma* of the Hindu has for its basis the law of inequality so that people may take their natural places in the society and rise or sink according to their value to their fellowmen, not only in the matter of material welfare but also in the matter of spiritual welfare.

The most difficult problem for the historian is to account for the existence of the *jati*. There have been many efforts to decide how it began. All of them have suffered from one handicap, that is lack of historical evidences. It would be true to say that nobody knows how it began. However, several theories have been put forward, and the highest common factor of them is that the followers of each limited occupation became converted into rigidly hereditary 'castes' each confining inter-

[4] *How We Live*, Fred G. Clark and Richard Stanton Rimanoczy, page 65.

dining and intermarrying to itself. At the occupational level there is now a mobility among the castes. Interdining among different castes has become a common feature. But endogamious marriages help the survival of caste distinctions. It must be pointed out caste does not stand in the way of the promotion of national unity.

That the concept of *Varna* allowed a man to pass from one class to another with the change of his disposition has historical evidence in support. The *Harivams* (300 A.D.) records the tradition that the sons of one Nagabhagaristha, belonging to the Vaisya group, became Brahmanas. The Greeks, the Scytho-Kushanas and the Hunas, foreign hordes that came to India, were regarded as Kshatriyas for their might and valour. The slow and subtle working of the *Varna* theory can best be illustrated by the example of the Abhiras. They were a Central Asian tribe that entered India during the confusion caused by the invasion of Alexander the Great in 326 B.C. (Tarn). In the *Mahabharata* they are regarded as untouchable *sudras*. The *Mahabhashya* of Patanjali (150 B.C.) shows that there was a slight improvement in their social position, for they were regarded as touchable *sudras*. In the third century A.D. an Abhira dynasty ruled in the Maharashtra country. Earlier *Manu Samhita* (200 A.D.) looked upon them as Kshatriyas. Later, when they associated themselves with the Gopala-Krishna cult they won honour and devotion from the vast followers of the Vaishnava sect.

These and several other instances show the Indian view "that diversity is the law of nature but unity must be sought in order to make life secure. This unity was brought about by the system of *Varna* through the medium of which foreigners and the non-Aryan groups of India found their way into the healthy social frame without creating any disturbance in the general life of the people."

In the age of the Guptas (300-550 A.D.) the caste system was still fluid in character and instances of intercaste marriages are known among royal families and might have been practised, though only exceptionally, among the common folk. Intermarriages doubtless played a good part in securing the absorption of foreign tribes like the Hunas in Hindu society. As regards foods,

the *Smritis* of the period forbid only eating with Sudras, though even here Yajnavalkya makes an exception in favour of one's farmer, barbar, milkman and family friend. Professions again were not strictly determined by caste. Brahmanas took to arms, trade and architecture, and there were several Brahmin dynasties of rulers and commanders of armies not to speak of officials in the various grades of the civil administration of the land. The army must have been open to the Vaisyas and Sudras as well. There were Kshatriyas who practised trade, and chief officers of a guild of oilmen are expressly described as Kshatriyas in a fifth century record. The old rule that the Sudras should be content to serve the twice-born might have lingered in theory, but no longer represented practice. They became traders, artisans and agriculturists, and the law-books of the time allowed it. The Brahmanas and Kshatriyas were the the natural aristocracy of the land and doubtless enjoyed social pre-eminence. In the middle ages during the Muslim rule the caste system assumed a rigidity which in some form or other still persists.

If the Hindu culture has persisted through ages despite political convulsions and social revolutions and if it has successfully combated destructive influence brought to bear on it by other cultures and civilizations, it is due to the institution of caste. Again it was this that taught "both high and low the art of governing and being governed by the rigid rule of caste". But unfortunately the caste became a closed system making society stationary, traditional and unprogressive. It degraded a mass of human beings giving them no opportunity for educational, cultural and economic advance. However, changes have taken place in the caste system and wisdom lies in taking advantage of the changing conditions and directing the changes so that as Jawaharlal Nehru says, "we can take full advantages of the character and genuineness of the Indian people as a whole which have been so evident in the cohesiveness and stability of the social organization they build up". Social relationship in modern times has been gradually modified by the abolition of feudal tenures, law of succession, legislation giving women rights to property and legal recognition of intercaste marriages. Birth is no longer the basis of social standing. New social and

economic forces are attacking the caste system at the base and particularly after independence some of the abuses of the caste system such as untouchability have been removed. Modern type of education and conditions of travel have set at nought ideas of caste seclusion.

Jawaharlal Nehru in his *Discovery of India* quotes Sir George Birdwood as having said: "So long as the Hindus hold to the caste system India will be India, but the day they break it, there will be no more India. That glorious peninsula will be degraded to the position of a bitter East End of the Anglo-Saxon Empire." Commenting on this Jawaharlal Nehru says:

> . . .the break-up of a huge and long standing social organization may well lead to a complete disruption of social life, resulting in absence of cohesion, mass suffering and the development on a vast scale of abnormalities in individual behaviour unless some other social structure, more suited to the times and to the genius of the people, takes its place.

We are now in a transitional period, and perhaps destruction is inevitable, but the question is whether it will be possible to build up something better which will help us reach the ideal of socialistic democracy. Mere destruction without a constructive scheme will lead to disaster. Laws relating to removal of social disabilities, recruitment to services without reference to caste, social status and the Five Year Plans for economic uplift of the nation are all calculated to build up a modern Indian society free from such burden of the past as the caste. But caution is needed to see that the burden of the new does not overwhelm ordered progress. Intelligent public opinion should lead to the gradual moulding of the society. It is indeed very difficult to say whether the prevailing caste system will ever completely disappear. The attempt of Basava, Ramanand, Kabir, and Nanak in the middle ages to abolish caste met with failure. Social reformers of the nineteenth century, Rammohan Roy, Keshub Chandra Sen and Swami Vivekananda, all tried to put an end to the caste system but were not successful. Even the Sikhs have not been able to overcome caste feelings. Muslims

also have shown a tendency to observe caste restrictions. The Syrian Christians of Malabar were early divided into sections which took on a caste character. High caste converts of Roman Catholicism have shown a marked tendency to hold themselves aloof from those of the lower orders. The growing national sentiment is steadily attacking caste feelings. The criticism is made that in the matter of elections and appointments casteism plays a part in India. To build up a substitute for the Hindu social order, which has so long preserved the identity of Indian society is no easy matter.

The existence of the caste system such as it is cannot be ignored. It is a healthy sign that no caste association has become a political party. As Masani states:

> Whether judged by results or regarded in the light of modern philosophical thought, the survival utility of the caste system is assured, if only caste-fellows bear steadfastly in mind that it asks for free souls rather than freemen, for moral rather than material strength; that the essential basis of the institution was the development of groups of individuals in consonance with their qualities and qualifications; that the key-stone of the structure was no detachment but union; that the element of exclusiveness and untouchability is repugnant to the social philosophy and tradition of the Aryan race; and that the main, if not the sole, object of the caste system should be to secure social efficiency on the democratic and socialistic principles of class collaboration and rule of law.

3. THE INDIAN VILLAGE

India is a land of villages. There are a little over 657,000 villages, where eighty per cent of the population live. The great majority of these villages contain only about 500 people each. In the modern age the town began to replace the village as the characteristic unit. Ideas developed in the town reach villagers through newspapers and political propaganda and so the rural outlook is rapidly changing. Those who have come in contact with urban life are hardly able to resist the temptation to migrate to the nearest town. Till the beginning of the twentieth

century it was life in the village that was really attractive to the rich as well as the cultured Indians.

> The encomiums bestowed on ancient village-republics of India by the observant British Indian administrators of the early nineteenth century, though we may not accept them as literally true, are clear proof that, until then, the village continued to be the real centre of social life and the principal nursey of social virtues. And from the hundreds of Cola inscriptions that have come down to us, we see that under the Colas the villages of Southern India were full of vigour and strength. [5]

In North India too villages flourished as in South India, but not much is known of their administration. Villages show clearly how they have served almost unaffected by the innumerable dynastic wars and the shifting of political power at the top. The cellular structure of Indian society that has sustained national existence through ages can be seen even in the present day village set-up.

The government by means of primary assemblies comprising the adult males of each village was the central feature of rural organization. Besides these assemblies, there were in existence many other groups and corporations of social, religious or economic character, each interested in looking after some local institution or function. The village assemblies and the groups alike derived their responsibilities from ancient custom and ideal right (*Dharma*) and the moral support of the public. The members of the village assemblies did everything possible to promote orderly and peaceful development of the village. The groups represented the particular interest, while the assembly general interest of the village such as dispensing justice and adjusting rival claims, to the satisfaction of all parties. Social life was dominated by innumerable groups in the village. The individual did not lack opportunities for self expression. By birth, residence and occupation and sometimes by choice he was

[5]K.A.N. Sastri, *Colas II*, p. 267.

a member of one or more of these corporate bodies, each devoted to specific local purpose. There were several types of assemblies each type having specific functions. There is evidence to show that committees were appointed for executive work in rural administration. The functions of these committees must have been determined after a fairly long period of trial and error.

In the Cola period the actual selection of a member to the committee of assembly was by lot called *Kudavolai*. On bits of palm leaves were written the names of eligible persons and these bits were thrown into a narrow-mouthed pot and well shaken in the presence of the assembly. A child was asked to take out one after another as many of the bits as were required for the purpose of the constitution of the committees. The selection was confined only to those who were duly nominated according to rules which laid down certain conditions which has to be satisfied by every person before he became eligible for such nomination. The work of the members of the *Sabhas* and committees was honorary. These village assemblies have definite responsibilities both towards the localities concerned and towards the central government. The political spirit of the time aimed at securing the harmony of classes rather than equality. "A healthy society based on a general distribution of small properties, which was free from the glaring economic oppression of one class by another had no particular use for the ideals of modern democracy." The description of Cola administration shows there was a high standard of administrative efficiency, perhaps the highest ever attained by the Hindu State.

The old practice of paying workers of the village in kind still persists in many villages. The washerman washes, barbers give unlimited shaves and potters make vessels required, priests help the performance of rituals and all these are given an annual share in the harvest of the grain in return for their services. Money economy has somewhat disrupted these conditions. The village of old was a self-sufficient economic unit; peasant and non-peasant families lived in harmony, cooperating with one another. The autonomy of the village continued till the beginning of the British rule in India. The British in order to extend their

authority and find market for their machine-made goods did all they could to shake up the village organization. The villages in pre-British days were, on all accounts, healthy and prosperous. Dismal poverty of villages seems to be of comparatively recent origin. Poverty, ill health and illiteracy are really inseparable factors. It is not easy to say which of these is the cause and which the result. The lack of mobility of labour is often attributed to caste system among others. This is only partially true, but it does not explain the poverty of India. There seems to be truth in the allegation that British imperialism was the strongest single force which led to the decay of village economy, for the rural craftsmen could not compete with British machines in production and the weavers were the worst affected.

The peasant tilled the land and the king was entitled to the rent due to him. Sometimes there was a middle man through whom the rent was paid. The king had power of deriving revenue or rent from the peasant. Where it was not possible for the king to maintain direct relation with the village there was an intermediary between the village and its ruler. When the ruler was weak, the intermediary became ruler for himself; in this way perhaps came into existence most of the petty princes and zamindars. There was in India nothing analogous to the British manorial system in which villeins bound to the land could be disposed of with the land. Indian feudalism remained right through fiscal and military in character, but never manorial. What the king or the intermediary wanted was not land in the village, but a share of the produce by way of rent usually one-sixth, which under the Mughals rose to one-third. The villagers were little interested in the wars among the ruler and it mattered very little to them whom they paid the rent. It was this attitude that was largely responsible for the apathy of the peasant in the politics of the country. The British administration brought the Thahasildar and the Revenue Inspector and the Settlement Officer in direct contact with the villages. Except in Zamins and Jagirs the British Government had direct authority for the collection of rent from the peasant. Village officials became hereditary and were loyal to the British Government. Village reconstruction was never seriously thought of by the British Government

although their Department of Public Works carried out irrigation projects and late in their regime they started cooperative credit societies. The centralization of government gradually lessened the respect for customary law, so that the self-governing village community became weaker. Changing times and conflicts have, during the British rule, led to the break-up of village self-government.

To resuscitate the village is one of the major aims of the Five Year Plans of the Government of India. The effect or money economy on villages and the extent of help that the Community Development Scheme gives to them will be discussed later.

4. HINDUISM AND PROGRESS

In India as elsewhere the prime values of religion and philosophy evolved from a close study of nature and natural phenomena.

The Hindu religion deals with polytheism, monotheism and pantheism as well as belief in demons, heroes and ancestors. It deals with "different lines of thought and fuses them into a whole by means of its philosophical synthesis. A religion is judged by what it tends towards. Those who note the facts and miss the truth are unfair to the Hindu attempt."[6] For the Hindu, the doctrine that the soul has only one life, a few brief years, in the course of which it determines for itself an eternal heavan or an eternal hell, seems unreasonable and unethical. The Hindu believes that life in the world is not the end of everything. He believes in as many births as are necesary for the soul to qualify itself for eternal life. "All systems of Hindu thought accept the idea of the continuous existence of the individual human being as axiomatic." As you sow so shall you reap. Every act produces its natural result in future character. This is *Karma* or Causality which is common to all Asiatic religions. Most Western writers regard this as a paralyzing fatalism. But really it is the opposite of fatalism. It means that if we find ourselves helpless and unhappy

[6] *The Legacy of India*, S. Radhakrishnan, p. 268.

we are not condemned to it by a deity outside of ourselves. "Raise yourself by your own effort" is the thought underlying the theory of *Karma*. Reconciliation with what is comes only when all human effort is exhausted. The idea that there are higher powers to rule our destinies prevents the individual from holding other people responsible for his suffering.

According to Radhakrishnan, *Karma* inspires hope for the future and resignation to the past. The concepts of rebirth and the law of *Karma* form the basis of the Indian ethics. These were formed very early, perhaps before the time of the Buddha, as the result of the fusion of the Aryan and pre-Aryan outlooks on life and its problems.

Karma, renunciation and non-violence, all these, it is pointed out, engender in the Hindu a passivity and an inaction and militate against progress by which is meant improving standard of living and adding to our material culture the products of scientific inventions and technological devices. Bal Gangadhar Tilak took up the challenge. In his *Gita Rahasya* he points out that the earlier portion of the *Bhagavadgita* is a positive energism. This is a revolutionary book, which without alluding to politics calls on people to rise and fight. According to Tilak's interpretation, the object of all action should be *Loka Samgraha* or the welfare of the world. Thus the *Gita* gives a social content to religion and emphasizes the welfare of the world as the purpose of all action. This is the very opposite of other-worldliness usually associated with the Hindu religion. The doctrine of sacrifice is given a wholly different meaning. Tilak emphasized the dynamic aspect of the *Gita* and stimulated people to action in such a way that the British Government even thought of prescribing the *Gita Rahashya*. Aurobindo in his *Essays on Gita* emphasized the rationalism of the four-fold order of society and showed that it had no relation at any time to the caste system as practised.

Another significant teaching of the *Gita* is the rejuvenation of society based on Krishna's declaration: "Whenever and wherever *Dharma* decays and unrighteousness prospers, I shall be born in successive ages for the purpose of destroying evildoers and re-establishing the supremacy of the moral law." This

means that qualitative change or revolution is a divinely ordained process.

Owing to the impact of the British a static society fell into a state of flux. The *Gita's* teaching came in as an aid to rouse people to action and stabilize the society. It promoted not only a religious fervour but social and political action. Hinduism itself became an intensely dynamic force. This trend in Hinduism is different from the dilution of Christian thought of the Brahma Samaj or the revivalism of Vedic concepts of the Arya Samaj or the Vedantism and missionary zeal of the Ramakrishna Mission. These are at best only socio-religious reform movements, mostly the result of Christian missionary attack on Hinduism. Tilak's interpretation of the *Gita* was definitely for the welfare of the world through action. Gandhi's exposition of the *Gita*, though not so learned as Tilak's, emphasized that the *Gita's* idea was not merely selfless action for the welfare of the world, but that the means adopted to achieve the end should be ethically right. The suggestion in Tilak's *Gita Rahasya* is that the action dedicated to God was above moral laws so long as the object was the welfare of the world, thus indirectly countenancing even violence. Gandhi attempted to correct Tilak's interpretation of the *Gita* and propounded the doctrine of Ahimsa or non-violence. Non-violence does not mean an absolute denial of force. It means that force used should not injure the nature of another's law of life, or *Swadharma*. Aurobindo's interpretation of the *Gita*, though philosophical, helped people understand its teachings in terms of life's problems.

There is nothing in the Hindu *Karma* and *Maya* that stands in the way of social and political progress, as is often alleged. If other-worldliness or negation of life had been practised, there would never have been the marvellous development of art, architecture, music, dance, drama and literature, both secular and philosophical, in the Hindu period or the vitality to resist the onslaught of Islam and Christianity. While the Vedas are still believed to be of divine origin and unalterable, the *Smritis* which explain them have been held capable of being interpreted to suit the needs of changing times. The philosophic resigna-

tion of the Hindus to the Islamic rule as well as that of the British was due to their political and economic helplessness, not to the so-called passivity of Hinduism.

Even the much condemned caste system does not hinder progress or development of nationalism. Everyone thinks that the caste to which he belongs is superior to others, no matter where it is placed in the social hierarchy. This pride serves a useful purpose, for it is always accompanied by intense solidarity. In a calamity like flood, fire or famine people forget caste distinctions and cooperate with one another for the common good. This cooperative spirit is a characteristic feature of all Asian nations. That is why Soviet Russia and China have been able to mobilize thousands of volunteers in order to execute large public works such as roads, canals and dams. That this group solidarity facilitates the development of patriotism has been clearly demonstrated by Indians when they stood as a man against Chinese aggression. The predisposition of the Indian to sacrifice himself for the group makes it easy for him to transfer his self-sacrificing spirit from the group to the nation. Hence if the individual considers himself socially and materially as a mere cog-wheel in a large machine it is no impediment to the development of nationalism or progress. While in worldly affairs the Indian subordinates himself to the group, in the higher spheres of thought, religion and spirituality he preserves a strong independence. But it is the reverse that happens to the individual in the West; in the higher spheres of life he easily conforms and at the same time claims greater freedom in economic and social matters. In India it is the Yogi who renounces the world for his individual salvation, but all are not to turn yogis and the individual is free to follow the *dharma*, which falls to his lot by birth, choice or accident, not only for the benefit of his own life, but also for the welfare of the society as a whole.

The present Indian values in the field of religion have evolved out of the heritage of the past, the impact of Islam, the contact with the West, the teachings of great religious leaders and the bitter experience of communalism in the early part of the twentieth century. Some important concepts and goals included

in these values deserve attention. The Constitution of the Republic guarantee : (*i*) that every individual should be free to practise his own religion; and (*ii*) that no one should be politically or socially disqualified for his religious views. Another concept is that the state is not co-terminus with religion. In other words, the state has no church in India as is found in some of the western countries. The state has power to intervene whenever there is any communal tension of fighting, so that the spirit of communalism may be nipped in the bud. It should be emphasized that ethics, which is based on the principle of natural justice, is considered to be the basis of Indian Life.

5. *Politics.* In ancient India politics was imbued with religion. The belief was that God ordained society with its institution of *Varnasramadharma*, a combination of caste and stage of life. Laws governing the society were supposed to have been envisaged by seers. "The ethical principles that were the bases of customary traditions guiding society became the foundation stone of the ancient Indian legal system and the science of state-craft." The *Arthasastra* of Kautilya, dated 200 A.D. by some and 300 B.C. by others, and the *Dharmashastras* give maxims about what ought to be rather than what prevailed; however, they contain enough to show that the laws of society and of general life were on par with the laws of the state, if not even of superior validity. The state was directly concerned with the protection and promotion of *dharma*, *artha* and *kama*, leaving the individual free to follow his own spiritual path to attain *moksha* (release from the cycle of birth and death). With a change in the pattern of social life the outlook of the state also changed but it could never divest itself of its power to preserve peace and order in society by checking unethical life.

There never was a state religion as such in India. Even Asoka, the champion of Buddhism, patronized equally the Brahmanas, the Ajivakas and others. Briefly stated, tolerance was the keynote of ancient Indian polity.

It was under the influence of the Kushana emperors that the divine affiliations of kingship became prominent. The king, though elevated to the position of *mahati devata* or a great god

as in the *Manu Samhita* (200 A.D.), was still enjoined to look after his subjects. It must be stated that the strong tradition of the land prevented the state from assuming a despotic character. The Santiparva of the *Mahabharata* declares that "harassing the subjects in his ignorance, by taxes not prescribed in the text, and motivated by *artha* only, the king does harm to himself". The state was controlled to a great extent by the ideal of natural justice or *dharma* which included within it the standard set up by the customs of the land. Maintenance of social order and giving scope for the fullest expression of individuality—maybe of groups rather than persons—were among the most important duties of the king. And the important concept is that the state should not only "protect the people but also should maintain the economic structure of society conducive to the fruitful occupation of the people in accordance with their natural talents and hereditary skill and the demands of society as a whole" (Datta).

The establishment of Muslim rule in India gave a shock to this ancient tradition. It was a theocratic state. The Islamic *Shariat* professed that all Muslims are equal in respect of personal rights and social status. In practice, however, many Indian Sultans denied this privilege to the converted nationals of the country. However, Akbar's administration as well as that of Jahangir shows a close resemblance to the views of ancient Indian thinkers.

During the British rule in India came in such political concepts as the rule of law, equality before the law and responsible representative government. The Preamble to the Constitution of India shows how these concepts have influenced the Constitution. While the conceptions of liberty, equality and fraternity have come from western political thought, the concepts of justice (*dharma*) and the unity of the nation come from ancient Indian culture.

Dr. K.M. Munshi observes :

> A new and a very important element introduced in the Preamble was the assurance as regards 'the dignity of the individual'. It implied that the Constitution was an instru-

ment not only for ensuring material betterment and maintaining a democratic set-up but that it recognized that the personality of every individual citizen was sacred. Dignity, it must not be forgotten, is a word of moral and spiritual import; it implies the need of creating conditions in which the individual might be led to beauty and perfection, which thus constituted an end of the state.

6. *Law*. In India the earliest form of law corresponded with natural justice as found in the Vedic texts. This natural justice which had been embedded in the tradition of the land was enforced by consensus in the assembly of elders (*Parishad*). In this way evolved the unwritten laws of the land. The early writers of law books in India did not recognize the state as the source of law but only as its regulator. The four recognized sources of law were the *srutis* or the *Vedas* the *smiritis* or the *dharmasastras*, *sadachara* or the recognized customs of the elite, and that which accords with one's own conscience. In paractice customary laws appear to have reigned supreme. *Baudhayana Dharmasastra* (400 B.C.) recognized the peculiar customs of the northerners and the southerners and maintained the validity of both in their respective spheres. Yajnavalkya goes a step further and gives the force of law to the customs in conquered countries irrespective of whether they fall under the description of *sadachara* or not. From time immemorial India has been having a plural society and as Sengupta observes: "The organ of authority in a religious society was the *Parisad* and in a minor degree, every learned Brahmana; in a military society, it was the king or the chief; while trade was ruled by its own guilds, communities like those of the Chandalas had their own assemblies and villages regulated their own affairs."

Commenting on the persecution of religious groups in Western Europe after the rise of Protestantism MacIver observes: "The age had not yet discovered that the ruler need not meddle with the religion of his subjects or that it was unnecessary to make a particular religion a condition of civic rights or that, when citizens were divided by religious differences, the firmament of order was not weakened but on the contrary much strengthened.

if each group was free to worship in its own way or to worship its own God."

The tradition of India has been to allow freedom of worship and not deny or curtail civil rights on grounds of religion.

Hindu law is seen as a living organism multiplying with force of time and enlightening liberalism and adaptability wherever the circumstance so required. For example, while the Mayukha interpretation giving greater right to women prevails in Bombay, Bengal is governed by the Dayabhaga law.

The general traditional values as embodied in the ancient Indian legal system may be briefly stated thus: law, besides satisfying the principle of egoistic utility, leads to order and harmony which form the basis of socio-economic life. It is ultimately inseparable from God, for He alone knows fully the conditions of real existence. It checks the autocracy of the state and the growth of individuality, and that is why some *rishis* place law above the king. Man's natural desire is to curb the power of others. To put a stop to this law is necessary in this world. Law being based on time-honoured custom demands our respect. Man cannot get rid of the pleasures of the senses; this is the law of nature; but unless this is legitimatized society cannot thrive. The violation of law should be "assessed with expert legal advice and sound evidence and punished with impartial strictness".

The Muslim rulers introduced in India the concept of Islamic law in a theocratic state. They, however, evolved certain principles for the non-Muslims such as the levy of *Jeziya*. They decreed that the personal law of Islam would not apply to them. Non-Muslims could maintain their old institutions, personal laws and forms of worship provided that they did not wound Muslim sentiments. The Islamic criminal code had, however, universal application. Under Muslim rule the traditional laws of the Hindus continued and the *panchayat* worked successfully.

The British took up the tradition of justice as it had been in the previous regime. But they thoroughly revised the criminal law and introduced new rules of evidence and new pattern of administering justice in civil cases. Personal law was recognized. This recognition of "the personal rights of all communities sprang primarily not from any superior virtue in the English but merely

from their position as a small band of foreign rulers, not particularly interested in the differences between Hindu and Muslim, but vitally concerned to keep their subjects content".[7]

The British were careful in the matter of social legislation. But the system of *sati* was declared illegal. Under pressure of some Hindu leaders a law was passed validating the remarriage of widows (1856). After the Montford reforms (1919), the Sarada Act was passed prohibiting child marriage in the Hindu community. Though the Act roused opposition at the time, subsequent social and economic developments have created conditions which have left that law far behind.

The Sovereign Parliament of India has gone deeper into the field of social legislation by the passage of the Hindu Code Bill. This is now attempting to do what a Manu or a Yajnevalkya did in ancient days.

7. *Arts.* The arts of India are fundamentally based on the traditions of different ethnic groups that make up the Indian society. Among the diverse elements of the classical as well as the folk arts, the ideal of *Dharma* which is the backbone of Indian culture pervades, exhibiting unity in diversity. One peculiar feature of Indian art is that side by side with the objects of extreme morality and puritanism there are sensuous ones. This is a pattern which seeks a reconciliation of the ideal of renunciation with that of enjoyment. Although the themes are invariably religious, they have never sacrificed beauty and expression. In the field of literature and music also the same features are found.

Tolerance is the marked feature of Indian culture and the arts too have developed in conformity with this general rule. The most fruitful age in the field of Indian arts is the period of six hundred years lying between 300 B.C. and A.D. 300. Though penetration of foreign influences can be traced both before and after this period, it must be said that the most vigorous assimilation in every sphere of Indian life took place in this period.

The Mauryan period (322-187 B.C.) witnessed the inflow of Iranian style in Indian architecture and sculpture. The Mauryan

[7]Griffiths.

palace discovered at Kumrahar near Patna was modelled on the Imperial Achaemenids palace of Iran, but in the hands of the Indian artists it excelled its model.

In the four hundred years that followed the downfall of the Mauryan empire Graco-Roman and Scythian influences played a dominant role in the western and north-western part, giving rise to the famous Gandhara school of art. The form illustrating the life and previous lives of the Buddha is at the start, according to Tarn, "largely Hellenistic" or influenced by "borrowing from Roman art". The same cannot be said with certainty in the field of drama, although much has been argued for and against Hellenistic and Scythian influences on Indian theatre. Patanjali (150 B.C.) refers to two dramas (*Balibandhana* and *Kamsavadha*) that were enacted during his time. Some fragments of a drama of Asvaghosha, a contemporary of Kanishka (A.D. 78-101 A.D.), were recently discovered in Central Asia. All this shows that the Indian theatre was well developed at that age. There is no clear evidence to show that the Indian theatre was influenced by Scythian models, but it is true that it made great progress under Scythian kings of Western India, as Levi observes.

Most Western scholars have untiringly expatriated on the theme that from prehistoric times there has been a flow of foreign influences into India. This hypothesis is still to be tested by Indian archaeology which in recent times has made a good beginning but which has yet a large field for exploration. The fact that before the rise of the Mauryas (322 B.C.) there could have been no foreign influence in India in important spheres of life except in the North Western region which now is in Pakistan stands out prominently. The Harappan art bears close affinities with the art found in Sumerian sites found in Western Asia. This shows that either the Harappans had close cultural connections with ancient Sumeria or as Hozny thinks both the peoples belonged to the same ethnic group having common cultural traditions. Whatever that be, the affinity of Harappan culture with works of Indian art found at Taxila, Pataliputra and other places proves clearly that the tradition of Indian art has been a continuous one from prehistoric times.

There is no gainsaying the fact that Mathura (a centre of

Vaishnavism and Jainism) in Uttar Pradesh and Amaravati in the valley of the river Krishna developed from the early centuries of the Christian era schools of sculpture free from foreign influence. Mathura represents "an outgrowth of the ancient Indian school" (Benjamin Rowland). Amaravati developed under the patronage of the Satavahana Kings of the Deccan and Buddhism supplied the inspiration to the artists. "The style of Amaravati extended to Ceylon, but Buddhist images in the Andhra style of the second and third centuries A.D. have been found as far away as Dong Hduong in Champa (Indo-China) and at Sempaga in the Celebes."

With the establishment of the Gupta rule in India in 320 A.D. we enter what is called the Golden Age of Indian History. Kalidasa, a poet of immortal fame in world literature, was a product of this age. To the same period or somewhat later belong *Manimekalai* and *Silappadikaram* regarded as gems of Tamil literature. The *Natyasastra* of Bharata of this age shows different techniques of theatre and dancing. The *Silpasastras* of this time lay down the Indian traditions in the field of architecture and sculpture. In the field of painting this age produced marvels and miracles as shown by the frescoes in the rock-cut caves of Ajanta.

In the post-Gupta age Buddhism lost its influence and Hinduism and Jainism came to the forefront. Havell seems to be right when he says that "Jainism cannot be said to have created a special architecture of its own, for wherever they went the Jains adopted the local building tradition". In North India there arose temples crowned by curvilinear tower (*Sikhara*). The South Indian temples, instead of *Sikhara*, have *Vimana* or "pyramidal tower with stepped sides almost akin to the Babylonian Ziggiurat". These temples with their *mandapa*, *prakara* and *gopuras* show the influence of folk arts in their excellence.

To sum up, the artists of the ancient period had well-defined ideals before them to which they conformed strictly. The beauty of Indian art is primarily based on spiritual values without ignoring aesthetic considerations. One of the most important principles followed was that art should be based on the frank acceptance of the facts of life. "This accounts for the fact that in a

country where religion forms the backbone of the people's life, works on erotics like the *Kamasutra* of Vatsyayana (4th century A.D.) which anticipate many of the Freudian concepts, came to be respected, and why obscenity characterises certain sculptures and paintings in some temples of Orissa."[8]

During the Muslim rule a new type of architecture called 'Indo-Islamic' came to the forefront. This is splendidly exemplified by the Tajmahal at Agra. It is said that while its architecture is entirely Muslim, its symbolism is Indian in spirit. The same characteristics are found in several other architectures of this age. The meeting and mingling of Muhammedan and Hindu styles can be found in the Rajput or the Mughal school of painting. The art of the Rajput school differs from the earlier one in that it is not purely a symbolic one. The music of the Hindu period was enriched during the Mughal age by new intonations; the Hindustani music of the North India differs from the Karnatic music of the South India. The alliance of two cultures is well illustrated by the rise of Urdu as a literary idiom. The Sufi saints believed in the efficacy of music as a way to please God.

It was during the British rule in India that Indian art in every field suffered a set-back. There was an attempt to infuse Western tunes in Indian songs. The Indian stage was influenced by the introduction of European techniques. In architecture there arose the 'dak bungalow' in Gothic style, which is described as a queer admixture of ideas of Victorian England with Indian technique. Lack of British sympathy in Indian art is well illustrated "by the acts of Lord William Bentinck who seriously considered demolition of the Taj Mahal and the sale of the marble". He was only diverted because the test auction of the materials from the Agra Palace proved unsatisfactory." The survival of the Indian architects is due to the support given by the Indian princes. Lord Curzon, whose interest in art and archaeology was almost passion, sought to preserve ancient monuments.

In modern times when India started the freedom movement

[8] *Traditional Values in Indian Life*, India International Centre, 1961, *p*. 35.

Indian artists showed a keenness to revive the tradition of the ancient days. In Bengal there arose a school of painting led by Abanindranath Tagore. A similar school was founded in Bombay. There is a feeling that the Indian tradition should not be ignored in architecture. In spite of the suggestion of the consulting Architect to the Government of India to build the new capital in consonance with the spirit of "the reawakened India of the present and the future" New Delhi developed in an alien style.[9]

The concepts and goals of the Republic of India in the field of art are :

(1) To preserve and encourage traditional art and welcome such Western style as can be developed on the basis of the early patterns.

(2) To encourage folk arts and take care to see that they are not marred by other influences.

(3) To promote an appreciation of classical music and folk music, discouraging the undue impact of the West.

(4) To see that the stage and the screen deal with Indian themes more and more, retaining at the same time essential western techniques.

(5) To open as many art galleries as possible to acquaint people with the real tradition of the country.

8. *Science.* Some historical perspective is needed to understand India's contribution to the world in the realm of science. In 1858 Whewell in his book *The History of Inductive Sciences* observed :

> ...almost the whole career of the Greek schools of philosophy, of the schoolmen of Europe in the Middle ages, of the

[9] In the course of his speech inaugurating the national art treasure's fund in New Delhi (February 23, 1952) Jawaharlal Nehru said: "New Delhi has always seemed to me to be a place without a soul and without spirit. In spite of its large structures of stone and brick and in spite of a certain attractiveness which some of the New Delhi buildings may possess, New Delhi is not an attractive place." According to him it lacks an inspiring atmosphere, which it could have had if the suggestion of the Consulting Architect had been accepted.

Arabian and Indian philosophers shows that we may have extreme ingenuity and subtlety, invention and connection, demonstration and method; and yet out of these no physical science may be developed. We may obtain by such means logic and metaphysics, even geometry and algebra; but out of such materials we shall never form optics and mechanics, chemistry and physiology.

This statement regarding the ancients and mediaevals may be accepted for general guidance; but we must point out that no impartial student of culture-history would miss the following noteworthy points, among others, in a survey of world's positive sciences:

(1) The 'Pure' mathematics of the Hindus was, on the whole, not only in advance of that of the Greeks, but anticipated in some remarkable instances the European discoveries of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. *That mathematics is the basis of the mathematical science known to modern mankind.*

(2) Hindu intellect has independently appreciated the dignity of objective facts, devised the methods of observation and experiment, elaborated the machinery of logical analysis and truth investigation, attacked the external universe as a system of secrets to be unravelled, and wrung out of Nature the knowledge which constitutes the foundations of science.[10]

The point to be noted is that the Hindus have a claim to be regarded "as pioneers of science and contributors to exact, positive, and material culture" on a footing of equality with the Greeks, "in quality, quantity and variety". The absolute superiority claimed for the Greeks by European writers cannot therefore be granted from the Hindu angle of vision.

The age of experimental and inductive science is only about three hundred years old. This period is considered as the epoch

[10] Benoy Kumar Sarkar.

of cultural superiority of the West over the East. At the time of the French Revolution (1789) there was hardly any difference between Europe and Asia. The difference set in with the application of steam to production and transportation. The mechanical revolution led to an industrial revolution in the first three decades of the nineteenth century. Thus "modernism" with its social institutions of science and technology brought about the surpremacy of Europe and America over Asia and Africa.

A.E. Zimmern observes: "The white races are strong not because they are white or virtuous but because they are strong. They are strong because they have acquired through a long course of thought and work, a mastery over Nature and hence over their weaker fellowmen, It is not virtue but knowledge to which they owe their strength." Inventors and discoverers came by nature. They worked and thought not for any single group of people or nation but for all peoples in the world. The Europeans among whom they sprang were clever enough to profit by the thoughts of these geniuses and built modern civilization upon cheap mechanical power.

> The quite temporary advantages that the mechanical revolution in the West had given the Europeans over the rest of the old world were regarded by people, blankly ignorant of such events as the great Mongol conquest, as evidence of a permanent and assured European leadership of mankind. They had no sense of the transferability of science and its fruits. They did not realise that Chinamen and Indians could carry on the work of research as ably as Frenchmen or Englishmen. They believed that there was some innate intellectual drive in the West, and some innate indolence and conservatism in the East, that assured the Europeans a world predominance for ever.[11]

The consequences of this infatuation were colonialism and imperialism. Thus far about the historical background; now let us trace the development of science through the ages in India.

In the *Rigveda* (1500 B.C.) along with hymns to gods we find the hankering of the human mind for unravelling the mysteries

[11] H.G. Wells.

of nature. To lay down rules for Vedic sacrifices in the *Brahmans* (900 B.C.) the study of geometry and astronomy became necessary. The former was needed for the purposes of constructing different types of altars and the latter for finding out the auspicious moment for the performance of sacrifices.

In the sixth century B.C. the Buddhist revolt against the authority of the Vedas coincided with the establishment of Takshasila (Taxila) as a great centre of learning where the science of medicine and surgery was taught. Soon Indian ideas began to flow to the West. Indian "influences" have been traced on Pythogorean mathematics and in the *Treatise on Winds* by Hippocrites and in *The Vimaeus* of Plato. In the second century B.C. when the Greeks of Bactria founded an empire in India, science, specially astrology, became enriched by Bactrian ideas. *Charakasamhita*, dealing with the science of medicine, was composed during the Kushana period. In this, references to preparation of medicines from metals indirectly show that chemistry was already in an advanced stage. Later Susruta produced his treatise on surgery. In mathematics the decimal system was first evolved in India and later on it influenced the Arab science of mathematics and through it the mathematics of the world. The Zero (0) was also first discovered in India. Alberuni (1033) wrote: "The numeral signs which we use are derived from the finest forms of Hindu signs."

According to Hankel, the Hindus are the real inventors of Algebra if we define algebra as the application of arithmetical operations to both rational and irrational numbers or magnitudes.[12] "The glory of having invented general methods in this most subtle branch of mathematics (Indeterminate Equations) belongs to the Indians."[13]

There is evidence to show that Indian Geometry developed uninspired by the Greeks. Aryabhata (476 A.D.) gave the accurate value of π. Its correct value was not known in Europe before Purbach (1423-61). The history of mathematics admits

[12] *History of Mathematics*, Cajori. New York, 1909; See Benoy Kumar Sarkar, 1918, *Hindu Achievements in Exact Science.*

[13] Nalinbehari Mitra.

Brahmagupta's (598-660) fresh contributions to Geometry. Though Hindu geometricians achieved much the same results as the Greeks, it must be admitted that they did not attain the excellence of Euclid (306-293 B.C.) in method and system.

Bhaskaracharya anticipated Newton (1642-1727) by over five hundred years (1) in the discovery of the principles of differential calculus and (2) in its application to astronomical problems and computations.

The cultivation of astronomy as science did not make less progress among the Hindus than among the Greeks under Hipparchus (150 B.C.) and Ptolemy (139 A.D.). Varahamihra's (505-87 A.D.) candid acknowledgment of the fact that astronomy was well established among the Greeks leaves no doubt about Greek influence in this field.

The debt of Europe to Saracen chemistry or alchemy is generally acknowledged by historians of science. This is indirectly an admission of Europe's debt to the Hindus for they had taught these teachers of mediaeval Europe.

History shows that India was the greatest "industrial power" of antiquity. The manufactures of the Hindus were found in the markets of Egypt, Babylonia, Judaea, Persia, ete. To the Romans of the imperial epoch, and the Europeans of the middle ages the Indians were noted chiefly as a nation of industrial experts. Patanjali (second century B.C.) gave elaborate directions for many metallurgical and chemical processes which show the knowledge of industrial chemistry of the period. The Mahrauli iron pillar of King Chandra shows India's activity in iron ores carried to its extreme excellence. During the fourth century the Hindus could forge a bar of iron, says Fergusson, "larger than any that have been forged in Europe up to a very late date, and not frequently even now."

Pliny, the Roman of the first century A.D., noticed the industrial position of the Hindus as paramount in the world. This position was maintained by India even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was after the industrial revolution and the establishment of British rule in India that the Indians lost their industrial hegemony. The preparation of fast dyes, the extraction of the principle of indigotin which anticipated modern

chemical methods and the tempering of steel show the important discoveries of the Indians in chemical technology.

The period extending from the fall of the Guptas to the Muslim conquest was generally one of stagnation, but yet there was a good deal of the cultivation of science as revealed in the courses of study of the universities of the period.

The concepts and goals that guided the scientific investigations of the ancient Indians included the following among others:

(1) That the mystery of the universe should be solved for attaining a true knowledge of the ultimate reality. The atomic theory propounded by Kanada led to the development of the Vaiseshika school of philosophy.

(2) That science should be cultivated in the background of *Dharma* and it must have a humanitarian end in view.

The following conclusions may be drawn:

(1) That scientific investigation was not confined to any particular province of India or to any race or class of the Hindu population. It was a cooperative effort in intellectual advance.

(2) That no one hypothesis or theory ever dominated the Hindu thought. The intellectual universe of the Indians was "pluralistic". There were different schools criticizing, correcting and modifying one another's enquiries.

(3) That the story of scientific investigation among the Hindus, like that among other nations, is the story of a growth and development in critical enquiry, sceptical attitude and rationalism.

In the mediaeval period nothing remarkable happened in the domain of science. There was, however, some activity in the field of astronomy. At Jaipur and Delhi, observatories were established for studying the positions of the stars and planets. The Unani system of medicine was introduced into the country. But this was not very different from the ancient Ayurvedic system.

"*Charaka* and *Susruta* were translated into Arabic about 800 A.D. and about sixteen other Indian works on medicine were

known to the Arabs in translation."

After the establishment of the British rule in India there was more talk about science than any determined effort to improve the economy of the country by the application of science to local industries. At first the Indians had no love for western science. Due to the agitation by Indian intellectuals science courses were introduced in the universities. The opening of the Institute of Science in Bangalore may be regarded as the first great step in the development of scientific studies in modern India. Great Indians that have made notable contributions to the field of science are J.C. Bose, P.C. Roy, C.V. Raman, K.S. Krishnan and a few others.

Dr. Homi Jehangir Bhabha was famous for his work in nuclear physics. He was one of the many men who were active in this new and difficult branch of science. He was the president of the First International Conference on the peaceful uses of Atomic Energy, which met at Geneva in 1955. This meeting of scientists produced very useful results. Coming back to India Dr. Bhabha founded the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research. He was the chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission and secretary to the Government of India in the department of atomic energy till his tragic death in a plane crash abroad (January 1966).

In the Republic of India the study of science is greatly encouraged and striking achievements have been made in the last eighteen years. Jawaharlal Nehru throughout his period of premiership of India did everything possible to encourage scientific work and research. He was the Chairman of the Board of Scientific and Industrial Research and was closely associated with the Atomic Energy Commission; through his effort a Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs came into existance (since merged in the Ministry of Education). This Ministry is keeping before it the following concepts and goals:

(1) That the power of nature should be harnessed for improving the general living conditions of mankind.
(2) That the use of science for destructive purposes must be restrained in every way. ...

(3) That proper facilities should be given to the rising generation for getting adequate training in science and technology.

As we see it, science is supported everywhere as a handmaid to industry. Scientific development generally takes top priority when some misfortune comes to a country in the shape of war. We saw the use of atom bombs in the second world war. There are big nuclear powers in the world, which are piling up nuclear weapons. Now there is a new competition between Russia and America in space flight.

The question that should seriously be asked is: "Has not science a nobler purpose than adding to the wealth of the nation and bringing about better conditions of living and using it for destructive purposes in war?" Great thinkers have thought about the question. Yet there is no clear sign of putting an end to the manufacture of nuclear weapons which can be used only for an evil purpose.

While science has grown tremendously we are doubtful if what is called the scientific spirit has developed even among the advanced countries to the extent it should. It is difficult to define exactly scientific spirit. People talk of science as something that declares war on nature and tries to control it. To Jawaharlal Nehru it was not war with nature but cooperation with nature to uncover the secrets of nature. The discovery of science often comes in conflict with society that normally stands for conservatism or rather has a reluctance for change. "So", as Jawaharlal Nehru said, "we come up against a certain inherent conflict in society between the coexisting principles of continuity and of conservatism and the scientific principle of discovery which brings about change and challenges that community." The scientific spirit would break the community, shake off conservatism and accept change. This does not easily happen in any society, however materially advanced it may be through the application of science to industry, transportation, etc. It is often pointed out that Indian reluctance to change is of a peculiar kind which militates against the development of science. To reinforce this idea, telling descriptions of Indian superstitions are given. Historically

speaking superstition has not had a deeper and more extensive hold on the oriental intellect than on the occidental. "To this day, quite a lot of people, in the most advanced countries still half believe in magic. In Britain and America, many people will not walk under a ladder, especially not on a Friday. Newspapers print advice as to what people born in certain months should, and should not, try to do on certain days. Few hotels have a room numbered thirteen. Airmen often secretly, or openly carry, lucky mascots and many fishermen believe that no fish will be caught if anyone in the boat mentions rabbits."[14]

Have such beliefs among Englishmen and Americans prevented them from scientific advancement? Why then should Indians be regarded as not fully qualified to embrace the so-called "modernism"? This is perhaps due to a modern kind of superstition about the non-whites.

A new science called Social Anthropology has developed in recent decades. Among the conclusions it has led to "one is that all the various and strange ways that exist in the world are all possible ways of living. Another is that none of them is perfect. We humans, young and old, have all without exception, a lot to learn.

"In this science, and in all the others that have to do with humans, friendliness, tact, courage, a sense of justice and respect for other people, are the virtues that are needed." We agree with Amabel Williams-Ellis in the conclusion that if all the things that we could learn from studying social anthropology were put into practice, the reward to the world would be very great indeed. Indian tolerance is nearer to the idea contained in these conclusions than any other.

We believe that the Indian, in spite of his reverence for the cow and belief in *puja*, is developing science and technology and can reach the heights of developed countries in this field. And more than all he is showing scientific spirit in his dealings with man and matter and can continue to do so.

9. *Education.* It is in the field of education that India has

[14] Amabel Williams-Ellis, *Modern Scientist at Work*, George Harrap & Co., Ltd., 1961, p. 119-20.

gone far away from her ancient ideals breaking off her past traditions. An exotic system of education came to be established primarily to produce subordinate officials and clerks for the British administration. The *Gurukulas*, Hindu *Tols* and the Muslim *Madrasas* languished for want of support. One of the most important principles of the Hindu type of education is that there is no antithesis between culture and vocation. The educated section of the community favoured the western system, which inevitably led to the falling apart of culture and vocation. In 1857 Universities were set up in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. Later on there arose other Universities in the country. Law colleges and medical colleges sprang up out of necessity. Illiteracy, premature withdrawal of children from schools, stagnation, and wide disparity between the number of boys and that of girls drawn into school were the marked features of the elementary stage of education at the time when India became independent (1947). Secondary education was several decades behind that in advanced countries. University education was purely of the academic type. One of the legacies of the British period is the unemployment of a considerable section of the educated youth of the land.

Mahatma Gandhi sponsored the Wardha Scheme of Basic education for children of the age group seven-fourteen. He described it as 'the spearhead of a silent social revolution', for it advocated integrated instruction through the medium of a craft or crafts. In practice the philosophy underlying the scheme was not properly understood. The hope that all elementary schools could be converted to basic schools within a period of ten years has not been realized to this day. The Seargent scheme gave a proposal to draw cent per cent children of school-going age to schools within a period of 40 years. This was not implemented. The University Commission produced a report called the Radhakrishnan Commission Report making recommendations. The Secondary Education Commission under the chairmanship of A. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar brought out a report making suggestions to bring Secondary education up-to-date and relate it to actual life conditions.

For some reason or other important recommendations of these commissions have not been fully implemented. With the dawn of independence the masses awoke to the need of education. There has been phenomenal increase in the student population at all levels of education. The character of education has not changed to suit the needs of the present day pupils, so that people talk of falling standards in education.

The Indian Education Commission has reported what may be done to improve education at all levels and of all types. It is hoped that some good will come out of the labours of the Commission. The growing industries require educated workmen, technicians, foremen and managers. It is now realized that technical education should be linked up with the industries and that general education should be work-oriented.

10. *Economic Life.* According to ancient Indian concept of economic life, individuals classified under certain groups should have their own traditions and hereditary proficiency in certain skills in industry. The principle that governed trade was that hoarding or undue raising of prices should be regarded as inimical to society. Epigraphic evidences show that the state looked after the moral and economic welfare of the people without burdening them with heavy taxation. The householder spent his life in the field of *artha* (earning through production) and *kama* (enjoyment) and in an advanced age he retired from the affairs of the world handing over his responsibilities to his immediate heir, usually the eldest son.

In the Muslim period the structure of Indian economic life saw no change. The Muslims preferred urban life. So the village economy continued unchanged. Baber, the founder of the Mughal empire in India (A.D. 1526) states: "Workmen in every profession and trade are innumerable and without end. For any work or any employment there is always a set ready to whom the same employment and trade have descended from father to son for ages." Living was then cheap. Trade with European countries declined, for in the middle ages it lay "strangled in the grip of the Turks".

In the British period the economic exploitation of India became a necessity in the interest of English manufacturers.

Age-long industries of India declined. The pressure on land increased. Agriculture in some respects became commercialized. India's indigenous products found market in Britain, Germany and Japan. Rail roads were constructed; postal system was established; banks sprang up and currency came into wide use. All these helped to create a national market. Several large factories such as the Tata Iron and Steel Factory developed in the early decades of this century. But the economy level of the country continued to be at a very low ebb.

It was after independence (1947) that concerted measures were taken for the economic improvement of the people. It has been asserted that "the basic criterion in determining social policies and the lines of economic advance should be not private profit or the interests of a few, but the good of the community as a whole".

The contentment with which a poor peasant keeps somehow his body and soul together is peculiarly an Indian asset. It is only he who knows well the ethico-religious doctrine underlying the peasant's attitude towards life that can correctly interpret his calm resignation.

The fundamental concept of the social structure is that service to fellowmen is service to God. It is this that has led to many philanthropic activities of well-to-do men to relieve the distress of the poor. Exploitation of the poor by the rich or of the weak by the strong is alien to the theory of Indian culture.

India's present economic goal is to increase the standard of living of the people by the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society. This means an attempt to increase the National Wealth. Per capita income has necessarily to be raised by provision of suitable employment for all. The five year plans are directed towards ameliorating the conditions of the poverty-stricken people.

Though the Indian by temperament resigns himself to his lot, he has always entertained the hope that he can through his effort improve his lot in life. That the social structure is ill-adapted to economic progress by the adoption of modern methods is a misconception of many Western writers. The law of cooperation that man does not prosper alone but by working together is

inherent in the Indian social structure. True, there is great deal of economic ignorance among the people. But this is found in all societies, the differenc is one of degree, not of kind.

For economic uplift higher production is necessary, both agricultural and industrial. The quantity and quality of production depend on the quantity and quality of natural resources, human energy and tools. Man has no control over the first; the rest he can improve. The Western countries are rich in their tools and power. India has to depend on them still to a large extent for machines and their component parts. She has to import them. This means ability to pay in dollars and pounds. She can do so only when there is a favourable balance of trade. Export depends on the needs of the buyers from India. Unless India produces those things, raw or finished, that Western countries need, India cannot have a favourable balance of trade to buy what she wants. This exchange position is now so tight that India restricts imports to just those things that are absolutely necessary for the country and saves exchange. In view of the acute exchange crisis, India has recently devalued the rupee. In spite of exchange difficulties India has made remarkable progress in her manufactures.

With regard to improving cattle-breed and production per acre of land it is money that is needed. When the per capita income is pitifully low, how can people be expected to save and invest? Good seed, fertilizers, modern implements and improved methods of cultivation—all these depend on the country's financial resources. It is wrong to think that people are not willing to change. If they are made to know that change is for the better there is no difficulty.

Jawaharlal Nehru dinned into the ears of the people that the material welfare of India depends on her per capita production of goods and services. "What worries the Indian planners is not where to find labour but where to find the jobs for all the labour there is and will be." India is rich in human resources. People must be helped to acquire necessary skill to work with machines. Planned development was started in 1951. At present we are at the end of the Fourth Five-Year-Plan and this may be followed by other Five-Year-Plans to achieve the socio-economic goals set

out. The goals and their content will go on increasing and deepening with the pace of development in India and the world. (The Five-Year-Plans will be discussed in a later chapter titled "Economic Development"). The impact of the plans is not yet felt by a very large section of the rural population. So people ask, "What have the plans achieved?" Really, there could be no complete achievement of goals but there could be progress towards the goals.

To prevent concentration of economic power in the hands of a few and to reduce disparities in income and wealth of the people a number of steps have been taken to reorganize the production apparatus both in agriculture and in industry.

In agriculture the middleman is practically eliminated; reforms to give tenancy right to tillers have been carried out; regulations to give the tiller security of tenure have been made; ceilings in agricultural holding are fixed. The control of the state in the industrial sphere is increasing to safeguard the interest of the people. Preferential treatment is given to new people entering industry and an attempt is made to locate new industries in new places to reduce concentration of wealth in a few places.

The first four plans are an important landmark in India's march towards prosperity and affluence. To improve the lot of one-fifth of the human race requires unremitting effort over a long period. The Chinese threat and Indo-Pak conflict have impeded the progress of the plan. Defence requirements have loomed large.

In the socio-economic field we have a variety of ideas about *flourishing and coexistence. This is in keeping with the traditions* of India. In the ancient and middle ages differences related to religion. Now conflicting ideologies are concerned with urgent economic and political problems. There is a strong pull towards secularism. The government and the people are involved in creating a better social order; with regard to the practical steps to be taken there is a conflict of views. The Congress Party which governs India today is wedded to democratic socialism developing the public sector in important areas, allowing at the same time the private sector to grow in other areas. The New Congress Party is giving a new orientation to socialism.

The problem of poverty has to be viewed in its world context. Colonial-imperialism is dead beyond recovery. However, old ideas of balance of power and spheres of influence still persist among the so-called developed countries which have one-third of the total population of the world. In their competition to maintain balance of trade they have developed a policy called economic imperialism towards the Asian, African and South American countries which have two-thirds of the population of the world Technology has sharply divided the world into two sections, the rich and the poor and there is a fantastic difference in their wealth. The poor countries have to depend on the rich for their development. India has resorted to planning which is the central part of socialism. At home there are some political parties such as the Swatantra Party which argues that planning and nationalization of industries have only tended to increase the power of the executive without bringing satisfactory relief to the poor. The split in the Congress Party is mainly due to the old guard's fear that the executive is growing more powerful than necessary to the detriment of democracy. Indira Gandhi's government, in spite of its absolute majority in the parliament, has no easy time of it to implement fully her party's socialistic ideas. Abroad, the governments of Britain and the United States feel forced to put a ceiling on trade. There is an unmistakable tendency among developed countries to look inwards. The nature of interdependence of nations is such that unless the industrialized countries are prepared to buy the goods, including manufactured goods, from the under-developed countries, there is no hope of reducing the disparity in wealth. It is to be noted that aid to developing countries is also being considerably reduced. It is hardly realized that poor countries cannot increase their wealth working in solation. It is difficult for us to imagine how the richer societies of the west can, in conscience, enjoy an isolated affluence, if the rest of the world remains in poverty. The problem of poverty is an age-old one and its solution needs international cooperation. We hope that it will be wisely tackled.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Life of the People through Ages

THE chief occupation of the people in India has from time immemorial been agriculture. Here is a description of the life of the village people as gleaned from the Vedas. They ploughed the ground, the plough being drawn by two oxen fastened to the yoke with hempen or leather traces and driven with goad. The ploughshare was made of iron which supplanted the older ploughshare. The fields were watered by means of irrigation canals, from wells or lakes or by raising water from wells by means of wooden or metal buckets tied to a rope pulled round a stone pulley. They reaped the fields with sickles. They threshed the sheaves on threshing floor, winnowed the corn in winnowing baskets and then carried it to their barns. Agriculture was followed not merely for one's own family for food but as a means for acquiring wealth.

Cowherds took cows out to pasture daily. Cows were milked not only by ladies of the household, but also by professional

milkers. Goats and sheep were reared and dogs were kept for guarding houses and cattle. Weaving cotton and wool was done by men and women. Carpenters made chariots and carts. Woodwork included wood carving. Houses were mostly of wood and were put up by carpenters who also made household utensils such as ladles, cups, buckets and bowls. Blacksmiths made weapons of war and agricultural implements. Workers in leather made casks for holding water. Bullock's hide was used for holding shields and making drums. The physicians employed spells and medicines to cure ills. Priests chanted prayers for the prosperity of the liberal lords from whom they received rewards. The bulk of the people were poor and borrowed at usurious rates of interest and repaid their debts in eight or sixteen instalments. *Atharva Veda* says that people died of starvation during famine. Men wore two clothes, the upper one especially on ceremonial occasions was of deer skin. The priests shaved head leaving a tuft worn in a knot. The clothes were of cotton or of wool. The men were very particular about bathing, and women bathed as now in rivers or tanks. Rice, barley, beans and sesamum were the chief vegetable food stuffs. The eating of fishes and birds appears to have been common. Fruits were also eaten. Foods were served on leaf platters, the lotus leaf being commonly used for the purpose.

The first important rite in the life of girls was marriage. The *Atharva Veda* gives details of different ways of marriage. In those days the people that did not follow the fire rituals formed the majority of the population. Perhaps their rites were exactly like the forms of worship observed by some non-Brahmins and scheduled castes today. The public rites of the fire cult were much more elaborate than the domestic rites. Animals were sometimes sacrificed. There were four stages in a man's life. The *Brahmacharya* was a period of education and celibacy, and the *Grihasthasrama* of married life. After a period of married life the man left home for contemplation and became a *Vanaprastha* and the *Sanyasa* was the stage in which the man renounced the world altogether for his salvation. We do not know if all the four stages were gone through by an individual with any regularity nor do we know how long these stages were kept up in

India. People believed in the efficacy of the *mantras*. The life of the people was greatly governed by these *mantras*. From before birth to after death the individual's life was governed by the *mantras*. Almost every custom and every institution referred to in the ancient texts are yet observed in India. Every *mantra* could still be heard and every image described in the ancient texts can be seen in thousands of villages today. There have been volcanic upheavals of society, like that which was caused by the spread of Jainism and Buddhism. There were also tremendous thunder storms of foreign invasions into India. But in spite of them all rural life in India is very little changed from what it was thousands of years ago.

Personal cleanliness is a special feature of Hindu life. Western critics say that there is no civic conscience among the people, for they do not keep their surroundings clean. Early rising and worship and going about one's duties with regularity formed part of the life of the ancient people. Throughout the ages they continued to be so, perhaps the discipline became weaker and weaker as centuries advanced. When modern means of transport and communication brought the villages in contact with towns, rural life began to disintegrate, but even now we see villagers clinging to ancient customs.

In the age of the Mauryas the vastness of India's agricultural and mineral resources and the extraordinary skill of the craftsmen were noted with admiration by the companions of Alexander and by Megasthenes. The building of boats and ships and making of carts and chariots and the manufacture of machines are mentioned besides house building. The Mauryan State itself was a vast industrial and trading concern and employed in its service vast number of artisans and merchants. Kings and Lords patronized learning, and art and craft flourished. In the age of the Guptas we have clear accounts of higher education, secular and religious. *Agrahara* villages were mostly centres of higher education. In this period Taxila seems to have declined. Nalanda, Vallabi and Kanchi were rising to prominence.

In olden days omens seem to have played a great part in the life of the people and later astrology developed. Even today omens influence the people, and newspapers and magazines not

only in local languages but also in English give regularly a forecast of the influence of planets on the lives of people for specific periods.

One of the changes that came over the people in their form of worship deserves mention. At first worship was through prayers. This was replaced by image worship in temples that probably arose in and after the third century B.C. Asoka's inscriptions make no mention of temples. Buddha, who neither denied nor accepted God, was idolized. It is an irony of history that images of Buddha should have been the first to be set up for worship. The visual appeal of the image led to the emergence of idol worship in temples. The temple filled a large place in the cultural and economic life of the people, and its role as a social institution can hardly be exaggerated. Its construction and the making of images to be installed in it gave employment to large numbers and scope for the talent of artists. On its daily routine depended numbers of priests, choristers, musicians, dancing girls, florists, cooks and others. Its periodical festivals were attended by fairs, learned contests, wrestling matches and every form of popular entertainment. In the middle ages the temple was also a great landlord, bank, school, hospital, fortress, and what not. The jewellers flourished on the demands of temples and places. Kings lavished their bounty on temples, and their courtiers and the merchant princes in the country followed their example. From very early days holy places became multiplied. Seven holy cities are known to classical literature: Haridwar, Kasi, Prayag, Dwaraka, Puri, Gaya and Kanchi. Similarly there are seven holy rivers. Places associated with the names of the heroes of the epics came to be regarded as holy places. Even today they draw thousands of pilgrims. Local objects such as a running stream, the bubbling spring or a volcanic fire came to be regarded as sacred and worthy of worship.

We have already noted how caste system became much complicated during the mediaeval times. The Brahmanas were the heads of *Gurukulas* and through their labours much that was handed down through oral tradition came to be reduced to writing. Before the Muslim rule began Indians seem to have enjoyed life passionately. They delighted not only in things of the world

but those of the spirit also. It is said that the teaching of the great *Acharyas* such as Sankara, Ramanuja and Anandatirtha, which stressed renunciation, struck a pessimistic note, depriving people of their joy of life, but exhorted the votaries of Hinduism to keep up the ancient ideals.

The imperial power of the Afghan rulers was much less felt in the villages than in the previous period. Muslim government generally avoided villages. Their representatives and agents were contented to govern the countryside from the seats of their authority in bigger towns. Among the temples built in the Muslim period the Sun temple built by Narasimha Deva of Orissa (1238-64) at Konaraka is a magnificent example of the art of the period. The Tajpal temple at Abu has been considered as one of the architectural wonders of the world. Besides morning and evening prayers at temples some days of the months came to be observed as fasts and some others as feasts and the holy days spread right through the year. It is in this period that daily life was complicated by popular belief in omens and astrology. The common man tried to do everything on an auspicious hour. The belief in the doctrine of *Karma* deepened. The caste system assumed a rigid form. It was during this period that inter-dining among the various sections, even of the same caste, came to an end. Innumerable sub-castes were formed due to difference in occupations or other causes. Brahmanas as a class stood apart from the rest of the people and even they were divided into innumerable sections. There were untouchables in the North, but in the South even their very shadow was regarded as pollution.

The Arab, the Turk, and the Afghan Muslims who poured into India formed a distinct group of ruling Muslims. There were mass conversions to Islam in this period. But the converts continued to call themselves by their caste names, for example Muslim Rajputs in the Punjab. The converts to Islam often stuck to their tribal or local customs and very rarely accepted the Muslim law. Muslim foreigners looked down upon these converts. The Shias and Sunnis stood ranged against each other as in Gujarat and Kashmir. The Bohras and Khojas in Gujarat were always treated as heretics. The slaves formed a class by themselves but were often allowed to high rank by their masters.

Tombs of Muslim saints became objects of worship both to Hindus and Muslims. This is the period in which Sanskrit scholarship continued to flourish and several law digests were prepared. Among them may be mentioned the *Deval Smriti* which laid down an elaborate purificatory ritual for taking back Hindus who may have left the fold. Amir Kshuru compares Indian men, women, rivers, flora and fauna with those of all the countries he knew of and conceded that India had the better of all the countries. The Turkish princes issued bilingual coins and the language used reflected the development of Hindi of the *Prithviraj Raso* which uses many words of Persian origin. Sanskrit continued to be the language of the scholarly world. *Bhakti* movement and mysticism appear to have provided solace to thousands of devotees.

Village life during the Muslim period continued to be the same as that during the previous Hindu period. Ceremonies and rituals were followed as regularly as ever before in order that Hinduism might preserve its identity unaffected by Islamic onslaught. As we have noted already, it was during the British period that the villagers began to lose their solidarity and feel emasculated.

In the later half of the nineteenth century there was demand for Indian labour by British capitalists in Ceylon, South Africa, Malaya and Fiji islands. Indians with the hope of bettering their prospects went as emigrants to work in mines and plantations. Some of them settled with their families in those countries. Then came the system of indentured labour, for the emigrants lived and worked for a specified number of years, after which some of them settled down there as free labourers or came back to their homeland, bringing with them ideas of life abroad. Their accounts broadened the outlook of villagers with whom they came in contact. Gandhiji worked for the welfare and civic rights of Indians who had settled down in South Africa and his experiences there led to the abolition of the system of indentured labour (1917) because it was derogatory to the nation. A large number of those that settled in Ceylon are now deprived of their rights of citizenship. After 1947 Indians that settled in Burma as traders, professionalists and landholders had to come back to

India owing to the severe nationalization policy of the Burmese Government. Then came refugees from Pakistan. All these have increased the complexity of Indian economic conditions.

The first decade of twentieth century marks the beginning of renaissance in India. The Congress, started in 1885, gradually made itself felt both on the British government and on the public. At first, it agitated for due representation of Indians in higher civil and judicial services and then worked for securing political rights for the people. It was Tilak who first turned the Congress into an organization for securing Home Rule for India.

Political consciousness among the people was awakened by the exercise of franchise for the constitution of taluk boards, district boards and municipalities. Ripon was the harbinger of local self-government in India. Discriminatory treatment to Britishers in railway travel and the Ilbert Bill[1] controversy roused the suspicion of the people and engendered feelings of racial antagonism. Japan's success over Russia in 1904 exploded the theory of Western superiority in science and warfare. Curzon's partition of Bengal to keep the Hindus and Muslims apart roused a nationwide protest. British goods were boycotted and the *Swadeshi* movement gained strength.

In spite of the prejudice against the British ruling class the public and princes of India cooperated with Britain in her war against Germany (1914-18). It was hoped that after this First World War the authoritarian regime in India would transform itself into a popular one in appreciation of India's war services. Nothing of the kind happened. Discontent among the people deepened. It was at this time that Gandhiji took up the leadership of the Congress and turned it into the mouthpiece of the Indian people. The response of the people to the call of the Congress demonstrated the native shrewdness and power of judgement of the uneducated masses of the people. About his first experience with the peasants of India in 1920 Jawaharlal

[1] According to law a European British subject could be tried only by a European and Ripon decided to abolish the "judicial disqualifications based on race distinctions. Ilbert, the then Legal Member, prepared a bill to give effect to the decision." The Europeans raised a storm of protest against it.

Nehru says: "I was filled with shame and sorrow, shame at my own easy-going-and comfortable life and overwhelming poverty of India. A new picture of India seemed to rise before me naked, starving, crushed and utterly miserable. There was only one way of ameliorating the conditions of "the rice eating puny millions of India." That was by freeing India from British domination."

CHAPTER SIX

Indian Nationalism

A NATION is thought of as a distinct race or people having common descent, language, history, government and habitat, but few nations possess all these common factors. The Jews, for example, had not a foot of territory which they could call their own, till in 1919 they were provided with a national home in Palestine. Nevertheless, all through the centuries of their dispersion, they preserved a high sense of nationality. The term 'nation' defies precise definition. Its chief ingredient is a corporate sentiment or collective consciousness, which makes people desire to live under one government and feel proud of their motherland. It must be pointed out here that the spirit of mediaeval Europe was not nationalistic, but ecumenical. Although the English people had shown their sense of nationalism earlier as in their Hundred Years' War with France, it was only in the early half of the sixteenth century that they exhibited their nationalism by successfully challenging the claims of the Papacy for

universal domination.

It is not easy to trace the origin and development of Indian nationalism. From the age of the *mantras*, to the Hindus India has been the land from the Himalayas in the North to Cape Comorin in the South, although the country may have been split up into innumerable independent kingdoms. We have already observed that the Hindu resistance to foreign invasions had always been nationalistic in character. Historical consciousness is a necessary component of nationalism. It is this which expresses itself in practical effort for the political and social uplift of the nation.

The critic says that the Hindus lacked this consciousness and so could not put themselves on a footing of equality with the Muslims or the British both of whom had rich and vigorous historical traditions behind them. True, before the publication of the results of European oriental researches to which we have alluded earlier, India had practically no written history beyond myths, legends and *puranas* to link up the past with the present. The absence of written history like the *Rajatarangani* of Kalhana cannot lead to the conclusion that the Hindus were not conscious of a heritage of their own, when in their daily life they felt proud of carrying it, to be handed over to the next generation. The history of India has been found in numerous inscriptions, grants, traditions, *puranas* and customary law of the people. Excavations such as those at Harappa and Mohenjodaro are ocular testimonies of the past glory reinforcing the heritage of the civilization of the vanished cities. The new thing is using historical consciousness as a political weapon. It is not easy for the historian to say how many of the nation states of Europe deliberately used historical consciousness as a political weapon against their adversaries in the course of history. Because there is no written history of the pre-Islamic period, of a type acceptable to Western scholars, it is argued that the Indians had not the capacity of connecting events with time and space. Hindu cosmology refutes the charge by its wonderful concepts of time and space. Kings had to adhere to the *Dharmashastra* and their *dharmas* were prescribed. Record of political events only would show the extent to which the rulers stuck to the *dharmas* or deviated from

them. A record of this kind did not perhaps seem important in human affairs when the seers and sages were engaged in the quest of the ultimate Truth. Anyway the hypotheses based on a lack of an authentic history for the Hindu period require careful and scholarly testing.

A long period of political subjection first to Muslim rule and then to the British did of course depress the Hindu spirit. In the late nineteenth century, India had a high type of leadership in social and political reforms. The facts of history revealed by researches came to be employed for political and social purposes. The first effect was a blind glorification of the past and an attempt at its revival. Leaders like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and Tagore sought to give a modern direction to the historical consciousness of the people: Ram Mohan Roy and later Ranade, Gokhale and Mehta believed that British rule in India was a case of conscience. While they were courageous in criticizing it they sincerely believed that the British connection with India was a divinely ordained one. Briefly stated, the liberals of the nineteenth century thought less of the Hindu past than of the political and social theories of the modern West. The first popular impulse was to promote a sense of pride of the past, recollecting the glories of the Mauryan, the Satavahana and the Gupta ages. Knowledge of the Indian colonization in South East Asia up to the fifth century A.D. and the glory associated with Champa, Kamboja, Sri Vijaya and Java and the maritime activities of Kalinga and the Southern Tamil kingdoms, all these served to revive the drooping spirit of the Indians in the nineteenth century. Ellora, Ajanta, Mahabalipuram, the temples of Orissa and the Cola bronzes brought a new meaning of art and architecture to the Hindus all over India. The Hindus felt that they were in no way inferior to their rulers. As a reaction to the revivalism there arose a movement to develop social and political institutions on Western models and promote a scientific spirit among the people, rejecting much of the past as a dead weight. The Gandhian approach to national problems was based largely on Tilak's theory of action, but with a greater emphasis on the ethical aspect of the action. For example, while Gandhi declared that the British rule in India was satanic, head monished his

countrymen to bear no hatred to the British people. It is difficult to determine how far Ghandhism used the newly awakened historical consciousness and political consciousness in leading the struggle for independence. This was a democratic socio-religious movement with ultimate political ends.

Political consciousness is generally understood as a capacity to make a distinction between various types of political institutions and to make deliberate choice among themselves. Indians, accustomed as they had been to limited absolute rule, found it somewhat difficult to understand the implications of modern ideas of democracy, although the grass roots of democracy could be found in the innumerable republics of India, in the Buddhist assembly and in the village Panchayats. Raja Ram Mohan Roy should be credited with having been the first Indian to understand and appreciate the character of political institutions of the West. He found that democracy was a dissolvent of British power in India, but it was not possible for him as well as for the other liberals that came after him to inculcate among general mass of people any strong or widespread desire for internal political freedom or democratic freedom. Gandhi was able to contact the masses and rouse in them a strong desire for political freedom and social justice. But here the critic may saucily say that an overwhelming majority of the people of India have been perfectly content with "an oligarchical one party rule", and so they have not shown their capacity to appreciate political freedom and personal liberty. There are people who sincerely bemoan the disappearance of the nineteenth-century liberalism in India after the advent of Gandhism. The way people have exercised their franchise shows how ideas of democratic freedom have permeated the masses. The Congress rule is due to the absence of a powerful party in opposition, capable of taking its place. In fact Gandhi advised that the Congress should be dissolved as it had achieved its purpose of securing freedom and that a new party should be formed. The leaders of the Congress being inheritors of power were reluctant to take the risk involved in Gandhi's suggestion. However, nothing prevents the formation of a strong all-India political party with a captivating programme to dislodge the Congress from its seat of power. Indian

nationalism has to be judged on its own merits. It has certain drawbacks as indeed the nationalism of any other country has. Casteism plays some part in the elections. Lingualism and parochialism often show their ugly features. The masses of people are often guided more by personal loyality to leaders than by institutional loyalty.

At the time when the British were supreme in India, the educated middle class serving the Mughals transferred their loyalty and service to the British authorities. The fact that the Muslims were the ruling class so worked on the minds of the British authorities that they preferred the support of the Muslims to that of the Hindus. When English took the place of Persian as the official language, the Muslims became dispirited. They did not take to English education. The Hindus took advantage of the educational opportunities and offered themselves for serving the British Government. It was high class Hindus that entered government service. The princes and lords in India having become subservient to the British authorities could not support scholars and artists as generously as their predecessors had done. Hence middle class intelligentsia of the community had to rely on service under the British for their very existence. Thus, the Kayasthas of Bengal, the Khatres of the United Provinces, and the Brahmins of South India entered subordinate civil and military services. Sir Sayed Ahamed Khan realized the position of the Muslims. In 1877 he started a college for Muslims in Aligarh with the object of imparting instruction (both Islamic and Western) and this later developed into the Aligarh University. The British authorities gave every possible support to the development of Aligarh University whose aim was to promote separatist tendencies among the Muslims. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan may well be regarded as the 'morning star' of the two-nation theory. Henceforward, it was the Muslims that steadily gained the support of the British authorities. The Muslims except for a few highly educated among them avoided the Congress. The Indian National Congress at first followed a moderate policy, claiming for Indians a share in the higher posts of administration. There were two schools of thought, one represented by Gokhale and the other by Tilak. Gokhale

was for the continuance of British rule until such time as Indians became fit for self-government, but Tilak stressed the evils of foreign rule, stood for a Hindu revival and opposed Westernization of Hindu society. He organized a festival in 1895 to commemorate the coronation of Shivaji every year and a festival for Lord Ganesha, the lord who would ward off all evils. Tilak asserted that Home Rule was his birth right.

His teachings played no small part in a wakening political consciousness among the people. In 1882 Ripon repealed the Vernacular Press Act of 1875 and newspapers in vernaculars sprang up. They served to promote political consciousness among the people. Services rendered by English dailies as the *Hindu* and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* are worth recording.

Legislative councils came up by laws passed in 1861-62 giving Indians limited opportunities for active participation in law-making and control of administration. But the people were not satisfied. In Bengal secret societies arose for political assassination. The partition of Bengal generated political activity all over the country. In 1906 the Congress declared Swaraj as its goal. Curzon predicted that Congress was tottering and would soon perish. But contrary to all that he said it became more and more powerful. The British stirred Muslims against Hindus. The Minto-Morley Reforms (1909) introduced the principle of election to legislative bodies in a very restricted measure. This only increased the discontent of the people. Anarchism in Bengal continued (1915-17). The Defence of India Act enabled the government to control the revolutionary movement. During First World War (1914-18) the moderates were weakened by the deaths of Gokhale and Mehta. Tilak and Mrs. Besant gained popularity and demanded Home Rule. It is no exaggeration to say that they laid the foundation for India's struggle for freedom.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Struggle for Freedom

DURING the first two years of world war (1914-18) moderate politicians and the princes and people in general were full of enthusiasm for the British cause. An ammunition board was set up to coordinate the activity of military supply and the arms supply to troops. This developed the manufacturing resources of India, because India was the base of supplies for many articles used by the imperial and allied forces. Nearly 1.75 million people were recruited for war and of them nearly two-third were combatants. The Indians hoped that the cooperation and support in war efforts would evoke from the British a favourable gesture for political advancement, but the British Government took the enthusiasm of Indian people as an expression of their tribute to the benevolence of the British rule in India. They made it clear that every political step would be postponed to a date after the war. The Indian soldiers found that they were not in any way inferior to European soldiers. They could not help feeling that

they were treated as inferiors to British soldiers in the matter of pay and rations. When they returned home after the war, they could find no useful employment and so stirred up discontent among the people. Conditions of war required raising of taxes all round. Duties on cotton goods went up high and rising prices added to the economic ills. The most important effect of the First World War was that Western civilization came to be regarded with less esteem than before. Although European nations belonged to the Christian community they had no compunction in fighting and killing one another mercilessly to win their cause. In 1917 President Wilson supported the ideas of national freedom and self-determination of people. The Indians began to demand self-government. In England, too, there was a good deal of rethinking and re-evaluation of old policies. Edwin Montagu, who succeeded Austin Chamberline at the India Office declared (20 August 1917) that the policy of his Majesty's Government was that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. This declaration satisfied neither the Hindus nor the Muslims, for the responsibility and the authority of the British Parliament and its agents continued to remain unimpaired. The Muslim League and the Congress met at Lucknow, composed their differences and evolved a plan of government for India. This was the Congress-League scheme which included separate electorates and weightage for Muslims.

Montagu visited India (1917-18). He was a man who was really interested in the welfare of India. That was a time when the agitation for Home Rule became persistent, and the Justice Party representing the non-Brahmanas in the South was outspokenly against the Brahmin community. Gandhiji was rising to prominence in Indian politics. He found that Satyagraha as expressed through passive resistance or non-violent non-cooperation which he had practised in South Africa would work well in India. Gandhiji's entry into Indian politics was a turning point in the history of freedom struggle. The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms published in July 1918 were embodied in the

Government of India Act 1919. This introduced a dyarchical system in the sphere of Provincial Governments. The Congress condemned dyarchy as likely to cause friction. The moderates welcomed it. In the provinces executives consisted of two sections, one section consisted of members nominated by the Crown, half of whom should be Indian and the other section made up of ministers appointed by the majority party in the legislature. The ministers were in charge of education, local self-government, forest and excise called transferred subjects. Finance, police and revenue were 'reserved subjects' in the hands of executive councillors. Muslims, Sikhs in the Punjab, Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christians got separate electorates. The working of the dyarchy had not been constituted on the principle of full-fledged dualism. Though there was 'joint purse system', *the ministers had no voice in the allocation* of funds. They had to depend on the goodwill of the reserved half for funds to work out their schemes. As the Swarajists of the Congress refused to form ministries, ministers had to be propped up and maintained in office with the votes of the official and nominated members, and they were naturally in too weak a position to assert themselves. Dyarchy proved a failure.

The supreme government continued to be unitary and responsible to the Secretary of State as before. The legislature became bicameral, the upper house was called Council of States which consisted of an elected majority. The official bloc ceased to exist. The franchise for the Council of States was based on property qualification. The Legislative Assembly had forty nominated members of whom twenty-five were officials and 106 members elected on a wide franchise, including women. The Governor General had the power to certify or veto any measure passed or voted down by the assembly.

These reforms went into operation in an atmosphere of tragedy and strife. That was the time when the Defence of India Act was due to lapse. To arm themselves with sufficient power to check the outrages of terrorists two stringent Acts popularly known as the Rowlat Acts were passed by the unreformed legislature in January 1919. This gave the authorities

power to try terrorists without a jury and imprison people on mere suspicion. The Rowlat Acts were a challenge to the Indian people. They roused the resentment of all the political parties in India. There were other causes which stirred up discontent among the labourers. Rich industrialists who had made enormous profits during war were unwilling to spend money on equipment or wages. The epidemic of influenza carried away many millions of people. Now Gandhiji wanted the people to observe a fast for twenty-four hours on 6 April 1919. By then Gandhiji had started civil disobedience movement. Following the murder of a European and a woman at Amritsar, martial law was declared. Amritsar was handed over to the military. All public meetings were forbidden. In the evening on 13 April, the Hindu New Year's Day, there was a large gathering in Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar. Unarmed people were shot at by armed men. In about ten minutes, 379 were killed and many hundreds were wounded. But eye witnesses put the figure much higher. For nearly nine months Amritsar was under martial law. The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy made people very angry. General Dyer, who was responsible for the tragedy, was appreciated by the British authorities and given promotion. Therefore, the relations between the British and the Indians became more bitter than ever before. In December 1920 the Indian National Congress met at Nagpur and declared that India's goal was the attainment of Swaraj by all legitimate and peaceful means.

From 1920 to 1945 the Congress was led by Gandhiji. Gandhiji's programme of action was very different from any that had been so far adopted by politicians in the country. He carried the mass of people with him. He lived in villages, dressed himself in the loin cloth like the lowest labourer and made it a point to live in untouchable colonies. He was for altering the fundamental class relationship in India. He set an example of leading a simple life. He advised Congress workers not to have possessions or facilities which the millions of poor people in India could not have. This in general led to a rearrangement of life among Congressmen so as to be as near to the peasant's life as possible. The masses understood

Gandhiji and responded to his call. But the urban middle class brought up in liberal traditions thought that Gandhiji's reliance on the illiterate masses was fraught with danger to society. His call to the educated people to give up luxuries was definite and clear. His technique was non-violent non-cooperation. He made those that were serving the government in various capacities understand that it was shameful for them to assist the Britisher in maintaining his dominion in India. He called on lawyers to give up practice and non-cooperate with the government in the administration of law. He appealed to students to give up their studies and go to villages for hard work. Another technique he employed was civil disobedience including non-payment of taxes. If indeed those who were cooperating with the government in various services had suspended their work, the entire government should have come to a standstill and Swaraj might have come in one year as he had promised. But this did not happen. However, it was no small achievement for Gandhiji that lawyers with roaring practice like Motilal Nehru, father of Jawaharlal Nehru, C. R. Das, S. Srinivasa Iyyengar, C. Rajagopalchari and T. Prakash willingly responded to his call.

Jawaharlal Nehru was ready and willing to follow Mahatma Gandhi. Indeed he was torn between the spiritual ideals of his motherland and the modernism of the West. He was for action and Mahatma Gandhi's programme appealed to him. But Nehru's outlook on life was fundamentally different from that of Gandhiji. He was unable to understand Gandhiji's intuitive decisions to call off civil disobedience, to undertake fasts on occasions, to bring moral pressure on people and insist on Khadi and on cottage industries in preference to industrial development of the country. Nevertheless, he realized that Gandhiji represented the masses of India and held the magic wand of rousing people to action. Sometimes he would storm against Gandhiji's decisions but he always yielded to the better judgement of his leader. Gandhiji knew his disciple and his capacity for self-sacrifice and devoted service. He therefore said that the nation would be safe in Jawaharlal Nehru's hands. Among those that worked with Gandhiji was Patel, who successfully led the No-Tax Campaign in Bardoli.

Gandhiji's saintly character won for him universal respect. Villagers regarded him as a Mahatma. By his incessant preaching he dispelled fear in the hearts of men and women in India. Rich men were willing to sacrifice their wealth and comfort. Some people in high positions were willing to give them up. The response to his call for non-violent non-cooperation was so striking that Lord Reading, the Viceroy of India, condescended to negotiate with him (13 May 1921), but the discussions produced no tangible results. Respected leaders all over the country were arrested and put in prison generally for short terms. In December 1921 the Nehrus and C.R. Das were arrested and sent to prison. But still the government considered it unwise to spirit Gandhiji away from the scene of his activities, for they felt that his presence would ensure non-violence. Official repression assumed such frightening proportions that even loyal government servants grew angry. In this movement women vied with men to exhibit their spirit of self-sacrifice and their readiness to go to jail. Nearly thirty thousand civil resisters were put in jail (1921-22). The way people sacrificed their wealth and comfort amazed and unnerved the government. In his despatch to the Secretary of State in February 1922, the Viceroy frankly admitted that the non-cooperation movement had been "engendered and sustained by nationalist aspirations".

Meanwhile elections to the legislatures went on. Only about a third of the voters took part in them. The Justice Party in Madras captured political power, so as to redress social imbalance between the Brahmanas and non-Brahmanas, under the leadership of Thyagaraya Chetty and T.M. Nair. In other provinces ministries were formed on coalitions of various groups. The Central Legislature was opened by the Duke of Cunnaught in February 1921. In April of the same year, Lord Reading succeeded Chelmsford as Viceroy. The British Government arranged for the visit of the Prince of Wales to India. The Congress Committee resolved on a boycott of the Prince of Wales. Hindu-Muslim tension, in spite of the best efforts of Gandhiji to bring about a union, grew worse. The Prince of Wales visited India on 17 September 1921. Those who led the boycott were arrested and imprisoned. In December 1921

Congress met at Allahabad and affirmed its faith in non-cooperation. Gandhiji was appointed as the sole executive authority of the Congress. In Bombay there were riots on the occasion of the Prince's visit. Mahatma Gandhi greatly resented this act and went on five days' fast. At Chauri Chaura in U.P. a violent mob killed two police officials and a sub-inspector. This made Gandhiji call off civil disobedience in all its forms. Gandhiji was, however, arrested and sentenced to six years' simple imprisonment. Accepting the sentence, Gandhiji said: "I do not ask for mercy, I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here therefore to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me, for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen."

Work of the legislatures went on smoothly. Indianization proceeded in the several services. Fiscal autonomy came to some extent. Military expenditure was reduced. The organization of the territorial force gave an opening to military life to the middle class Indians. There was a deficit in the Viceroy's budget and the Viceroy had to certify a bill for doubling salt tax (1923). Gandhiji was in jail. Motilal Nehru and C.R. Das thought that non-cooperation should be combined with council entry and so formed a new Swaraj Party. Their policy was to wreck the reforms from within the council. In the new Assembly Swarajists secured fifty out of 140 seats. In the provinces except Bengal and Central Provinces nowhere was the Swarajist strength enough to mend or end the council.

In 1924 Motilal Nehru carried a resolution formulating national demand for a round table conference to frame a scheme of responsible government. There was a general sense of frustration and the Congress needed someone to give them a sense of direction. Motilal's resolution resulted in a report; the majority of the member of the committee recommended details for the smooth working of dyarchy, while the minority held that dyarchy was inherently unworkable. The government accepted the majority report. Lord Birkenhead, Secretary of State, challenged the Indians to produce a constitution of their own. The Indian National Convention accepted the challenge.

In April 1926 Lord Reading was succeeded by Lord Irwin.

At that time fierce communal riots broke out in Calcutta. In the next elections Swarajists lost heavily in the Central Assembly but gained in the provincial councils of Bengal, Bihar and Madras. Gauhati (Assam) Congress declared itself against acceptance of office until the national demand was conceded. Irwin wanted to break the impasse and bring about communal harmony. He urged on the Home Government to deal with the actual facts of the situation. Thereupon a commission of seven members, all British under the presidency of Sir John Simon, was set up to enquire into the working of the constitution. As there was no Indian on the commission the moderates under Sapru and the Congress Party under Motilal united in opposition to the commission. Simon was empowered to include six elected Indian members of the Central Legislature to sit with the commission and report separately at the same time as the British Commission.

In December 1927, the Madras Congress resolved that its goal was *Poorna Swaraj* or complete independence. On 3 February 1928, the Simon Commission landed in Bombay. There were hartals and hostile demonstrations wherever the commission went.

There was an All Party Conference which drafted a constitution. This was mainly the work of Motilal Nehru and Sapru. This accepted the Muslim point of view over the formation of the North Western Frontier Provinces and the separation of Sind and recommended the abolition of communal electorates. Jinnah, the Muslim League leader, was a signatory to this report. Gandhi, who was now free, re-entered the political field and allowed Vallabhbhai Patel to start Satyagraha campaign at Bardoli against the unjustified increase in the land revenue assessment. After six months Patel succeeded (1928). Jawaharlal Nehru did not at all like the constitution framed by the All Party Conference. However, at the Congress session in Calcutta in 1928 the constitution was accepted on condition that if the British Government did not accept it before the end of 1929, the Congress would be free to launch a countrywide non-cooperation movement, including non-payment of taxes. Meanwhile the depressed classes under Ambedkar, the Muslims and

the Hindu Mahasabha formed parties to press their communal claims.

The Simon Commission paid two visits. While leading the boycott of Simon Commission at Lahore, Lala Lajpat Rai, a veteran Congress leader, was beaten in the chest in October 1928; he died on 17 November. This caused deep resentment and great sorrow to the people of India. In December 1929 the Congress met at Lahore under the Presidentship of Jawaharlal Nehru and declared that complete independence was the goal of India. January 26 was declared as Independence Day. Subash Chandra Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru wanted to take action on the Congress resolutions, but Gandhiji refused to yield. Some months later Gandhiji decided on defying the Salt Law. He wanted the abolition of the Salt Act. Jawaharlal was not much impressed with Gandhiji's move but very soon found that this item of poor man's food caught the imagination of people. Gandhiji's historical march to Dandi, a sea-side resort on the west coast, was a tremendous success. On 5 April 1930, Gandhiji ceremoniously broke the Salt Law. Men and women in all parts of India enthusiastically followed Gandhiji in breaking the Salt Law. When Gandhiji was arrested civil disobedience movement gathered strength. Ninety thousand satyagrahis were seized and sent to prison. The massive character of the satyagraha unnerved the Viceroy and the British officials. The Garhwali troops refused to open fire on an unarmed crowd at Peshawer, and military experts viewed the situation with alarm. The feeling came upon the British officials that it was impossible to govern the country in defiance of Mahatma Gandhi.

The first Round Table Conference was opened in London on 2 November 1930. Those that represented India were all Viceroy's nominees. The Congress and Gandhiji did not attend it. In 1931 Ramsay Macdonald held out hopes of making a sudden transfer of power to India. At the Round Table Conference minorities were unyielding. Each of the groups was claiming a virtual veto on progress. It was impossible to reach an agreed solution.

With the approval of Ramsay Macdonald, Irwin took the

bold step of releasing the Congress leaders and withdrawing the notification declaring that the Congress was an illegal association. Irwin negotiated with Gandhiji and the pact between them was published. The Congress agreed to discontinue civil disobedience and to take part in the next session of the Round Table Conference and the government agreed to withdraw its ordinances and release the political prisoners not convicted of violent crime. The only gain of this pact was that Mahatma was recognized as the real representative of the Indian people.

Irwin left India on 18 April 1931 and Willingdon, a very different man, became the Viceroy. Gandhiji left India for London as the sole representative of the Congress. The second session of the Round Table Conference lasted from 7 September to 1 December 1931. Gandhiji claimed to be the sole proper representative of all India including Muslims, depressed classes and other minorities. Now the Muslims became suspicious and did not want self-government for India, for the Muslim minority would ever be under the control of the Hindu majority. No agreement could be reached and Macdonald declared that if Indians could not evolve an agreed settlement his government would impose a provisional scheme of their own. On 28 December 1931 Gandhiji returned to India. His lieutenants including Jawaharlal Nehru had been by then put in jail. There was ordinance rule prevailing in India. Willingdon was bent upon crushing the Congress. Gandhiji was arrested on 4 January 1932 and put in Yarawada jail. The Working Committee of the Congress was declared an unlawful body. Its records and papers were all seized and its funds were sequestered, and thousands of people were sentenced during the year.

In August 1932 the government published their communal award. Thereupon Gandhi began a fast unto death to secure its modification (20 September 1932). Ambedkar, the leader of the depressed classes, yielded to the moral persuation of Gandhiji and the Poona Pact was concluded between the Congress and the depressed classes, according to which reserved seats were provided in general constituencies for the depressed classes. This pact was accepted by the government. The third and final session of the Round Table Conference was held without the

Congress and the Labour Party (November-December 1932). A Parliamentary Joint Select Committee was appointed to draft a Government of India Bill. It was resolved that Burma should be separated from India. The White Paper did not satisfy even moderate Indian opinion. Full control was still retained by the British Government as the legislators of India's destiny. The bill became law on 2 August 1935. This Act retained all the objectionable features of communal representation. Dyarchy was abolished. There was no substantial improvement in the effectiveness of the Council of Ministers, for the Governor and the Governor General could, according to the instrument of instructions, nullify any assertion of popular will in the country's administration. The Viceroy had special powers and responsibilities relating to the maintenance of internal peace, defence, foreign policy, safeguarding of financial stability and of minority interests. The British policy was to make use of communal differences, so that they might postpone the date of transfer of power to Indians.

The Congress fought the elections and accepted the responsibilities of government in provinces in 1937. The Congress policy was to bend the constitution to its will or to break it. The federation proposed in 1935 Act was objectionable to the Congress but it never came. The Congress Ministers did not accept office in the majority provinces until they were assured by the Viceroy that the governors would not use their special powers in day-to-day administration. The Muslim League fared very badly in the elections. It could not secure a majority in the legislature even in provinces where Muslims were in majority. But still the League demanded that the Congress should admit its representatives in all provincial legislatures as the Congress Muslims could not represent the Muslim community. The Congress was unyielding and Jinnah grew very angry with the Congress leaders. From then on he vigorously put forward his two-nation theory and organized the Muslims for direct action. During the brief time of their office the Congress ministries succeeded in maintaining law and order and put through much favourable social and economic legislation.

The Second World War broke out in September 1939 when

Lord Linlithgow was the Viceroy of India. The Viceroy dragged India into the war without explaining to the Indian leaders the war aims and the implications of his action. He was constitutionally correct no doubt; but when the Congress Committee found that India was denied the privilege of consultation which had been extended to other dominions, it, refused its cooperation in the war conducted on imperialistic lines. The Congress called upon the British Government to state whether the war meant freedom for India. There was no favourable response from the British Government and so the Working Committee asked the Congress Governments to resign and seven provinces passed under the Governor's rule. In 1940 the Congress offered cooperation in the war effort, if its political demand was accepted.

Earlier the same year the Muslim League resolved at Lahore that India should be divided into two states, one for the Hindus and the other for the Muslims.

The weaknesses revealed in the last elections made Jinnah realize the necessity for securing the solid backing of the Muslim masses in all the provinces and developing a well-disciplined militant party structure.

> To achieve this, in the Provinces in which the Congress Governments were functioning, a bogey of 'atrocities' against Muslims was raised and steadily maintained by the League: the use of the national flag, the singing of Bande Mataram, permitting music before mosques, the prevention of cow slaughter and the use of Urdu, the adoption of the Vidya Mandir scheme, etc. figured largely among the 'atrocities'. A number of Inquiry Committees were appointed, and they put out highly inflammatory and tendentious reports. And, when the Congress Ministries resigned in October, 1939 on the War issue, the Muslim League celebrated 22 December 1939 'as the "Day of Deliverance" from tyranny, oppression and injustice during the last two and a half years'. It is clear that the story of the Congress 'atrocities' was fabricated for propaganda purposes, and the charges were grossly coloured and exaggerated.

In March 1940 Jinnah succeeded in making the Muslim League pass a resolution on Pakistan and thereafter the policy of

the League was that India should be divided into two states, one for the Hindus and the other for the Muslims.[1]

The Hindu Mahasabha under M.S. Aney condemned the two-nation theory and demanded dominion status and Hindu predominance in the defence force. The Viceroy proposed to Indianize the executive council and set up an advisory council including representatives of the states, but the Congress rejected this offer. The Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League accepted it in principle, but each wanted more places and guarantees which were not in the power of the Viceroy to give.

Now Gandhiji resumed the leadership of the Congress. He chose 1,500 men to carry on the new movement of individual as contrasted with mass civil disobedience. The government strictly forbade the publication of news relating to this move. The first man to court arrest was Vinoba Bhave. Premiers and fifteen ex-ministers found themselves in jail before December. Nehru was sentenced to four years' rigorous imprisonment for his speeches to peasants of U.P. Many other leaders were swept into prison at the most critical period of the history of the country. The war effort was seriously affected. The finance bill was rejected by the Assembly but the Viceroy certified it. Subhas Chandra Bose disappeared from his residence while on parole in January 1941. It was reported that he was organizing a Provisional Azad Hind Government and Indian National Assembly for the liberation of India with the Japanese aid. There was a clause of the Atlantic Charter relating to war aims stating that "they respect the right of all people to choose the form of Government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them". Indian leaders considered that this clause applied to India also. But Churchill, the Premier of England, maintained that it related only to the countries overrun by Hitler. Through the influence of the Indian press and the Viceroy's council the satyagrahis including Azad were released. Churchill was against enlisting cooperation of the Congress in any manner.

[1]Sir Maurice Gwyer and A. Appadorai, "Introduction," *Speeches and Documents on Indian Constitution 1921-47*, Vol. 1, p. L.

Much to the chagrin of Churchill, Chiang kai-Shek and his wife visited India in February 1942 to discuss supply routes and defence of Burma. They took the opportunity to persuade Indian leaders to join actively in the war effort.

On 8 March, the Japanese Army entered Rangoon. It became necessary for the Viceroy to break the political deadlock in India. A British Mission headed by Sir Stafford Cripps (member of the War Cabinet) came to India. Cripps was a friend of Nehru and Congress, and this was enough for Jinnah to suspect Cripps. The Cripps plan offered dominion status, but the constitution-making body for all India including states should be set up. The constitution-making body had two conditions to fulfil : (1) the provinces not acquiescing in the new constitution would be free to have their own constitution; (2) undertaking to be given to the British Government that the interest of the racial and religious minorities would be duly protected. It was impossible for any constitution-making body to satisfy these two conditions. The British Government's policy was very clear. The problem of minority was to hang permanently as a millstone round the neck of India. The Cripps plan was not acceptable to the Congress. The Muslim League was glad that the principle of Pakistan was accepted. But Jinnah insisted on an unequivocal recognition of Pakistan as a precondition for considering the Cripps proposals.

The people were disappointed. The Congress Executive's 'Quit India' resolution adopted in Bombay on 8 August 1942 was a natural reaction. This resulted in the arrest of prominent leaders including Nehru. The mass movement gathered formidable strength. The government could bring it under control only after employing what Gandhiji called 'leonine violence'. In order to focus world attention on India, Mahatma Gandhi went on a fast for twenty-one days from 10 February 1943. Gandhiji's disciple Miss Slade, known in India as Mira Ben, said at the end of the fast : "God spared India the sorrow and England the shame."

Linlithgow, the Viceroy, laid down his office in October 1942, leaving India more divided than it had been before his arrival. It was during his regime that Bengal experienced a famine which

claimed one and a half million human lives. Wavell succeeded Linlithgow. He was convinced of the need to secure the cooperation of the Congress. But pressure from the Home Government prevented him from negotiating with Gandhiji. The virtual exile of the Congress between the years 1942 and 1945 led to a tremendous growth in the strength of the Muslim League. Jinnah was uncompromising in his attitude. On 14 June 1945, Amery, the Secretary of State, announced that the Viceroy's Executive Council would be reconstituted and that appointments to it would be made giving equal representation to Muslims and caste Hindus. But the proposals were full of snags and limitations. Jinnah insisted that all the Muslim members of the proposed council should be chosen by the Muslim League. This was regarded as an untenable claim, and Wavell, the Viceroy, could go no further with the proposals.

After the Second World War things moved rapidly. In Britain in the last week of May 1945 a general election was held. The Labour Party came to power, and Atlee became the Premier of England. Wavell was authorized to announce on 19 September that steps would be taken for the 'realization of full self-government in India'. In proof of its good faith all the members of the Working Committee were released. Elections were held in January 1946. The Congress did well and the Muslim League also came off with flying colours. It was impossible for any non-League candidate to secure a platform. Jinnah was jubilant.

It was India's great good fortune that the Labour Government was very sympathetic towards Indian nationlists' anxiety to settle the political question. A Cabinet Mission consisting of the Secretary of State, Lord Pethick Lawrence, the President of the Board of Trade, Sir Stafford Cripps and the first Lord of Admirality, A. V. Alexander, arrived in India in March 1946. The British scheme attempted at the impossible task of bridging the gulf between the demands of the Congress and the Muslim League. It envisaged a Union of India with the British Indian Provinces and the Princely States as its constituent parts, and there were proposals for the reorganization of the provinces. The proposals were not acceptable to Nehru. Jinnah accepted

them with mental reservation for he saw the 'germs' of Pakistan in them. There is no use trying to apportion blame between the Congress and the League, for they did not survive, for no fault of the members of the Cabinet Mission. The Mission left the country on 29 June 1946. Jinnah wanted his party to be invited to join the Viceroy's Executive Council as he had accepted the Cabinet Mission's plan. But Labour Government thought it unjust and risky to let the Muslim Leaguers in when the Congress stood out. Jinnah's pride was deeply hurt when a few weeks later the Congress was allowed to join the provisional government. Thereupon Jinnah stirred the Muslims to resort to 'direct action' to attain Pakistan, "to vindicate their honour and to get rid of the present British slavery and the contemplated caste Hindu domination". Thus the disciple of that prince of moderation, Gopalakrishan Gokhale, bade good-bye to constitutional methods and began the 'Battle for Pakistan' (16 August). We have no place here for the atrocities committed against the helpless Hindu population in Bengal, particularly in Calcutta. General Tucker, an eye-witness, wrote: "...it was unbridled savagery with homicidal maniacs let loose to kill and to maim and burn. The underworld of Calcutta was taking charge of the city." There were reprisals against the Muslims in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Mahatma Gandhi did his best to bring about a peaceful atmosphere.

Nehru and his colleagues joined the Viceroy's Executive Council on 2 September 1946 at a time when the Muslim League was threatening civil war. We may say that self-government in India began with the formation of the interim government. Jinnah soon realized his error in not joining the provisional government. He therefore sent his men to adopt obstruction tactics.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Independence and Partition

EFFECTIVE power had been transferred to Indian hands when the interim government was formed in 1946. The entry of the Muslim League representatives into the interim government, brought about complete disunity of that government, depriving it of all moral authority. Hindu-Muslim tension was aggravated throughout the country. The Congress was not for partition, and the Muslim League was against the unitary government. There was a political deadlock. The state of uncertainty that existed was fraught with danger. A firm decision had to be taken with regard to the future so that the period of transition might be as brief as possible. Accordingly, Atlee's government on 20 February 1947 made it clear that India must govern herself by June 1948 whether there was any agreement as to the form of the constitution or not. The position changed when Hindus and Muslims came to know that the British Government was determined to end its responsibility for India. The Congress

and the Muslim League engaged themselves in finding a solution to the *political problem*. At this stage Lord Mountbatten succeeded Lord Wavell as Governor General. He was a man who could tackle the problem, for he had a fondness for rapid action.

Gandhiji's attempt to win over Jinnah for a unitary government failed. The League was determined to have India divided, and nothing could be done to resist this determination. It is said that if Rajaji's suggestion to agree to the partition had been accepted the massacres that followed the decision for partition could have been avoided. But Jinnah's attitude stiffened with every conciliatory move of the Congress. While the claim of the Congress to represent the entire nation was challenged, the Muslim League's contention that it represented the entire Muslim population of India was accepted. Mountbatten had no choice except to divide India, and within three months of taking office he recommended complete self-government accompanied by the partition of India with effect from 15 August 1947. The British Government accepted this recommendation and in fulfilment of British intention to grant self-government to India the Parliament passed the Indian Independence Act. This Act conferred on India full independence. It provided in principle the partition of India subject to local ratification. It ended the relationship between the Crown and the Indian States so that the princes were free to decide their own future. The states could either be independent or accede to India or Pakistan. The question was the division of territories between India and the newly formed Pakistan. Jinnah made impossible proposals such as the inclusion of the whole of Bengal, Assam and the Punjab in Pakistan. He even demanded an eight hundred miles corridor between East and West Pakistan, but nobody took him seriously. The problem of the division of territories between Pakistan and India in the Punjab and Bengal was a knotty one. In the Punjab terrible massacres of the minorities were going on. Penderal Moon says that the Muslim mobs "suddenly as though on a preconcerted signal came out in their true colours and with weapons in their hands and in some places, steel helmets on their heads, indulged in murder, loot and arson on a scale never

witnessed before in the Punjab during a hundred years of British Rule."

British statesmen's pronouncements implied that India could get self-government on four conditions: that a new government must be based on agreement between Indian parties; that India must remain within the Commonwealth; that India must remain one and undivided; and that minorities must be protected. The announcement of the British Government rejected all these conditions. India was partitioned. Imposed safeguards for minorities were considered incompatible with self-government. India was free to leave or remain in the Commonwealth. Indian Independence Bill was passed without division in the Parliament; on 18 July it obtained the Royal assent. Atlee described the Act "as not the abdication, but the fulfilment of Britain's mission in India, a sign of the *strength and stability of the British* Commonwealth". It was decided that India's Independence should be declared on 15 August with the seceding areas assuming similar status on the preceding day calling themselves Pakistan. At midnight on 15 August 1947 the Constituent Assembly declared India to be independent amidst scenes of emotions.

We are yet too near the situation to give the exact causes of the withdrawal of Britain from India. It was no doubt, as Atlee put it, the fulfilment of Britain's mission in India. It became increasingly clear to the British authorities that it was not possible to hold India without embittering the feelings of all sections of the Indian community. The attitude of the military, navy and the police was definitely nationalistic. The trials of the soldiers of the Indian National Army formed by Subhas Chandra Bose were resented by the people. There were signs of rebellion in the navy. The civil services too were very much affected by nationalistic feelings. We are reliably informed by some respectable Indians, who returned to India from England during the years immediately following the end of the Second World War, that British soldiers who had first-hand knowledge of the poverty of the Indian masses spoke about it feelingly to their friends and relatives. This knowledge filtered down to the people, generating a feeling that perhaps with independence the

Indians might improve their economic condition. In that case the unanimous support of the Parliament to the Indian Independence Bill may well be regarded as having mirrored the desire of a discerning section of the British public to see India free. More than all it was a fortunate circumstance that the Labour Party was in power and Atlee, a sincere friend of India, was the Premier of England.

Three things had to be done before the transfer of power. The first was the partition of territory. A boundary Commission was appointed to make the demarcation, both in the Punjab and in Bengal. This was presided over by Sir Radcliffe, who was ably assisted by V. P. Menon. The next was the division of the apparatus and personnel of civil government. Then came the division of military assets and formation. India and Pakistan loyally accepted the Boundary Commission's award. A part of the Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and North Western Frontier Province formed West Pakistan and East Bengal became East Pakistan. The other British territories became India, with the states having the freedom to join either India or Pakistan. An Arbitral Tribunal, presided over by Sir Patnick Spens, the retiring Chief Justice of India, was set up to adjudicate disputes arising over the division of assets and liabilities.

It is not necessary for us to follow the complicated details of the division of assets and liabilities of India and Pakistan. Muslim civil servants in India and non-Muslim civil servants in Pakistan were given the option to choose India or Pakistan. This affected not only transfer of senior officers, but those of all grades. In the Railway department alone 16,000 employees, a considerable number of whom were technicians, asked for transfer from India to Pakistan. The police force in Delhi was greatly depleted because of the transfer of Muslim members of the service to Pakistan. Those that came to India from Pakistan were all men of the civil and administrative services. It needed Gandhiji's personal intervention for a settlement of the division of cash balances as well as allocation of public debts. A Joint Defence Council, with Auchinleck as Supreme Commander under Mountbatten, was established. This Council performed the delicate task of dividing the armed forces and their plant and

machinery, equipment and stores between India and Pakistan. The functions of the Supreme Commander were to end on 1 April 1948.

After 15 August 1947 violence on a scale unknown previously in the history of India broke out in the Punjab and Bengal. Gandhiji moved about in Bengal to restore peace and order. It is difficult to say who began the orgy in the Punjab, the Muslims or the Sikhs. The Governor of the Punjab assured Jinnah that he had done his best to clear West Punjab of the Sikhs and the Hindus. Muslims and Sikhs roamed the country committing unbelievable outrages. District officers were powerless and the Boundary Force was unable to fulfil its functions, for the soldiers refused to fire on their coreligionists and it was disbanded later. Nearly forty per cent of the entire Sikh Community was rendered poor and homeless owing to the partition of the Punjab. Large populations were uprooted from their ancestral homes; their women were abducted and submitted to unspeakable indignities; men and women and children were butchered in cold blood. Many groups of refugees were attacked on the road and put to death. Refugee trains were derailed and their passengers murdered. The Governments of India and Pakistan were helpless to restore confidence and prevent great movements of population. They addressed themselves vigorously to the task of feeding and protecting the terror-stricken refugees. We have no place here for the story of the operation of the Joint Military Evacuation Organization. In forty-two days (18 September to 29 October) twenty-four non-Muslim foot column, 849,000 strong with hundreds of bullock carts and head of cattle, had crossed the Pakistan border into India. Between 27 August and 6 November 1947 the Railways carried 2,300,000 refugees inward or outward across the Indian frontier. In India the refugees swelled the unhappy ranks of the unemployed and made the food problem more acute than ever it had been before.

Gandhiji very much lamented the situation that compelled such mass migration. He addressed himself to the task of promoting reconciliation between the Hindus and Muslims with his characteristic thoroughness. He pleaded in his prayer meetings in Delhi specially for the Muslim minorities in India. This

seemed incongruous, when mob fury in West Pakistan was almost unchecked. The behaviour of a certain section of Muslims in Delhi towards the displaced persons from Pakistan weakened the hands of the Mahatma to pacify the distressed refugees. With a firm resolve, he continued to preach his message of peace, love and tolerance. On 12 January 1948, he undertook a fast on behalf of the Muslims in India against Hindus and Sikhs. Mahatma Gandhi's outspoken love and friendliness towards the Muslims in India cost him his life. On 30 January 1948, he was shot dead by a fanatic Hindu. People everywhere in the world mourned India's loss, and said that it was impossible to see the like of him anywhere in the world again. Gandhiji's martyrdom did not solve the problem of refugees. By the middle of 1948 about five and a half million non-Muslims moved into India from West Pakistan. About the same number of Muslims left India for Pakistan. According to the estimation of the Government of India, non-Muslims left behind them property worth Rs. 500 crores in West Pakistan. The Muslim loss in India is put at Rs. 100 crores. It took a long time to settle claims of compensation between the two countries. The resettlement of the refugees was a hard task for the Government of India.

CHAPTER NINE

Integration and Reorganization of States

A DIFFICULT and delicate problem that faced India at the time of transfer of power related to the future of native states. There were 552 states, large and small, covering an area of nearly 716 thousand square miles. The attitude of the princes towards the new Union of India was one of unconcealed hostility. These states contained nearly a population of ninety-three million. They did not form a solid geographical block but were scattered all over India. The British refused to transfer paramountcy to an Indian Government and the states could have remained separate kingdoms if it had been possible. As Coupland says: "an India deprived of the states would have lost all coherence. For they formed a gray cruciform barrier separating all four quarters of the country. . . . India would live if its Muslim links in the North West and North East were amputated, but could it live without its heartbeat." The continued existence of these states had served no useful purpose except to

meet the imperial necessity of Britain in India. The best solution to the states' problem lay in their total dissolution. But the majority of the princes excepting a few like the Maharaja of Baroda proclaimed their determination to fight the Congress to preserve their independence. The task of integration of the states with the Union of India fell on the shoulders of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, who was a member of the interim government in charge of the states department. It was hoped that the task would be completed before the date of actual transfer of power, i.e. 15 August 1947, and Patel had hardly a month before him. Sir C.P. Ramaswami Iyer, Dewan of Travancore whom Montagu describes as "one of the cleverest men I have ever met in my life", said that his state was an independent entity and would be free to deal with any government in the world.

At that time there was a loose talk that the Southern States of Travancore, Mysore and Hyderabad might form a federation independent of the Union of India. The Nizam of Hyderabad who held the key to the situation was too vacillating for the concretization of any such proposal and Patel was relentless in the exercise of his pressure on the princes. Fortunately for India, the idea of separation of the princes remained a figment of imagination. To make a long story short, all the states within the geographical limits of India acceded to the Indian Union; only Hyderabad, Kashmir and Junagadh held out. Some historians level two charges against Patel's policy of integration of states: one is that "many states were dragooned into accession" by him and the other is that the drive for the popular movements in the states to attain that measure of freedom that the British provinces in India had been enjoying came not from the people themselves, but from New Delhi. Even such critics grant that "the states had become an anachronism and that it was desirable that an independent India should sweep them away". Indeed the British Government should have abolished them before transfer of power. But they did not, with the result that the three states of Hyderabad, Junagadh and Kashmir raised a crop of troubles, Kashmir still continues to be a source of friction between India and Pakistan.

To the Maharaja of Baroda should be given credit for the patriotism with which he voluntarily surrendered his rights and privileges to the Indian Union, setting an example to the other large states. Jinnah's explicit statement (17 June 1947) that it was open to the states "to join the Indian Constituent Assembly or the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, or to decide to remain independent" was really subversive of the very existence of India.

The Nawab of Junagadh was an inefficient ruler excessively addicted to dogs and wives. The state was not contiguous to Pakistan which could be approached only through the sea. Hindus formed the majority of the population of the state. The Nawab yielded to Jinnah's exhortation that he should 'keep out' of the Indian union "under any circumstances until 15 August." Jinnah promised to the Nawab enough Pakistan Reserve Police to help him rid the state of the Hindu majority. The aggressive designs of the Nawab and his mentors went awry because of the vigilance and timely action of Patel. The Nawab sought asylum in Karachi. Junagadh and its two feudatories were merged into the Indian Union as a result of the referendum held in February 1948.

At first the Indian Government was generous to the Nizam of Hyderabad, Mir Usman Ali Khan, who had been pampered by the British Government with the conferment of the title of His Exalted Highness in 1918. He believed that he was distinct from the other members of the princely order and put forward claims to independent sovereignty so that it became necessary for Lord Reading, the Viceroy, to cure him of his obsession by administering a snub in 1924. It was suggested to the Nizam that he might accede to the Indian Union Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications, subjects over which he had no control during the British rule. He not only refused, but insisted that he should be treated on an equal footing with the Union Government in the course of negotiations. Patel was willing to flatter the Nizam to some extent but the latter put forward fantastic claims of sovereignty, depending on his militant Razakars and the support of the Muslims of India and Pakistan. The Nizam kept his state in near war conditions. Jinnah, ignoring international proprieties, declared (1 June 1948) that the Nizam's

dominion was an "Independent state and that not only the Muslims of Pakistan but the Muslims all the world over fully sympathize with Hyderabad in its struggle".

Patel found that negotiations were of no avail and that military action alone could solve the problem. On 13 September 1948, the Indian troops marched into Hyderabad under the Command of Major-General Chaudhary. The Nizam to his dismay found that all his preparations for war were of no use. The Razakars and their fanatic leader Razvi ran for their lives. The Nizam realized that submission was the better part of valour. On 17 September after about 108 hours of military operation Hyderabad, whose existence for seven generations owed mainly to the British protection, acceded to the Indian Union. Britain's sympathy with the Nizam should be understood in the context of sentiments arising out of Hyderabad's long standing association with the British power. Percival Griffiths somewhat mournfully observes: "Whether India was justified or not in the action she finally took is a matter about which historians may well argue for generations to come, but the practical man is bound to consider that the inclusion of Hyderabad in India was the only satisfactory conclusion possible."

Kashmir has a proud history of its own from the Vedic age. It is strategically situated. At the time of partition it had a Hindu Maharaja ruling over people, the majority of whom were Muslims. Mountbatten, when he was the Governor General of India, at the request of Indian leaders assured Pakistan that India had no intention of forcing the Maharaja to accede to the Indian Union. But in the autumn of 1947 tribesmen from Pakistan territory with the connivance of the Pakistan Government invaded Kashmir and precipitated matters. The Maharaja had been hesitating to accede either to India or Pakistan, for in each event there were formidable risks. Alarmed at the approach of the invaders towards the capital Srinagar, the Maharaja sent word to New Delhi that he would accede to India. Thereupon Indian troops were flown in to defend Kashmir against both the tribesmen and the Pakistan army which had entered the state. Pakistan refused to regard the accession of Kashmir to India as a settled fact and continued to fight. India

took the case to the Security Council of the United Nations. The claims and counter claims of both the countries have been periodically reviewed at the Security Council but no decision has so far been arrived at. On January 1949 the U. N. Commission arranged for a cease-fire between India and Pakistan. India holds two-thirds of Kashmir and demands restoration of the rest now under illegal occupation of Pakistan.

Patel, a man of indomitable will, high courage, swift and sane decision for action carried through the threefold process, assimilation, centralization and unfication of the states. Small states numbering 216 were merged with the neighbouring provinces. A certain number of principalities such as Bhopal, Kutch and Manipur were constituted into centrally administered areas.

The other states, large and small, were formed into six groups, namely, Saurashtra, Rajasthan, Madhya Bharat, Patiala and East Punjab, Travancore-Cochin and Vindhya Pradesh. Each group was to have at its head a *Rajapramukh* who was to be elected by the council of rulers from amongst the former rulers of the states. It is not necessary to get into the complicated details of the financial integration of the states or the extent of the privy purse given to each prince. The privy purses and privileges too were abolished in 1971. Writ petitions challenging the government order in this respect are pending disposal at the Supreme Court. It was soon found that the presence of *Rajapramukhs* was incompatible with Indian democracy and in the course of the reorganization of states on linguistic basis the states under *Rajapramukhs* were spilt up and distributed among the contiguous states.

The Union of India still remained incomplete owing to the existence of the French and Portuguese enclaves. The French Government took a realistic view and ceded Pondicherry, Karaikal, Chandranagore and Mahe to the Indian Union. But the Portuguese were adamantine in their attitude towards the Indian Union. They said that as Goa was a part of the metropolitan territories of Portugal they were not affected by the British and French withdrawal from India. The Portuguese authorities started ill-treating their subjects because they favoured a move to join the Indian Union. They would listen to no reason. At

last Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, lost his patience. The Indian army marched into Goa to set things right. The Portuguese were driven out of Goa. Western peoples disapproved of India's use of force against their declared policy of non-violence. Both the Asian and African countries welcomed the Indian action as a blow against colonialism.

The formation of linguistic provinces was also looked upon as a dangerous source of disintegration. But the Congress stood committed to it. Political leaders, particularly, in Andhra, clamoured for the formation of linguistic states. A committee consisting of Nehru, Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya was appointed to consider the question. The committee frankly owned that "when the Congress had given the seal of its approval to the general principle of linguistic provinces, it was not faced with the practical application of the principle and hence it had not considered all the implications and consequences that arose from the practical application". Nehru set his face against formation of linguistic provinces for fear that it might lead to the development of fissiparous tendencies. He would have postponed the problem indefinitely if the Communists had not exploited the Telugu demand for an Andhra state in the elections of 1952. Potti Sriramalu went on a fast unto death in support of the Andhra demand. The agitation was so intense that Nehru had to agree to the formation of the Andhra State (1953). This inevitably led to the question of state boundaries and the States Reorganization Commission was appointed, and its recommendations led to linguistic states, with the exception that Maharashtra and Gujarat still continued as one state (1956). Over the separation of Bombay state into Gujarati and Maharashtrian areas, feelings rose high, leading to riots in Bombay and Ahmedabad. After two years of intense Gujarat agitation the new State of Bombay was partitioned. From May 1960 a separate state of Gujarat with Ahmedabad as its capital came into existence. Bombay city remained the capital of Maharashtra.

The Sikhs demanded a separate state for themselves but this was not considered favourably because no clear-cut distinction between Punjabi and Hindi could be made out. PEPSU was

merged with West Punjab and Himachal Pradesh came under Central Administration. In August 1961 Master Tara Singh began a fast unto death for the creation of a Sikh state but was persuaded to abandon it in October. In June 1966 the West Punjab was split into two states; the Punjabi-speaking areas forming one Sikh State and the Hindi-speaking areas the other. There were protracted and complicated discussions regarding the reorganization of states. The ultimate result is that India now consists of twenty-one states besides eight union territories (Vide Appendix A). Nehru was completely indifferent to local as distinct from Indian patriotism. To him states reorganization was mainly a matter of administrative detail, But unfortunately his view has not been accepted by large sections of the public in India, so that questions of state boundaries, division of river waters, and merger of territories like Goa continue to give trouble.

CHAPTER TEN

The Constitution of India

THE Constitution of India was framed in circumstances that differed from those that obtained when the American and the Canadian constitutions were framed. The U.S.A. evolved out of a number of independent states that had been unconnected with one another except through their common subordination to the British Crown. The states rebelled against British authority, and won the War of Independence by forming a loose federation among themselves. The constitution had necessarily to limit the authority of the federal centre, for the states insisted on retaining for themselves all powers not specifically transferred to the Union. The Canadian federation grew up according to Keith under the shadow of the great conflict between North and South in America. After a period of unsatisfactory unitary government, Canada adopted a federation avoiding the American error of leaving the power to the states undefined. Canada has a strong central government with which

residuary powers rest. The federation of the colonies in Australia arose not out of any necessity but for convenience. There the federal government was, therefore, given only those powers that were deliberately surrendered by the states. None of these conditions existed in India in 1947. From 15 August 1947 the Constituent Assembly became a full sovereign body. This Assembly was free to frame any type of constitution without consulting any outside authorities. There were, of course, provincial rivalries, but in the first flush of pride of independence all petty differences were forgotten. The Constituent Assembly consisted of the pick of the nation. It is not possible to mention the names of all those illustrious men. But Dr. Ambedkar and Alladi Krishnaswamy Iyer must be mentioned for their great services in framing the constitution of India. The members of the Constituent Assembly were most of them lawyers of international reputation, well-versed in constitutional law. The situation in 1947 was different from what it had been in December 1946, when the Constituent Assembly came into existence. After partition there was no necessity for limiting the powers of the central government. The historic objective resolutions moved by Nehru stated that the territories comprising British India and acceding states "shall possess and retain the status of autonomous units, together with residuary powers, and exercise all powers and functions of the Government...except such powers as are vested...in the Union".

The framers of the Constitution of India drew liberally from many sources. The Government of India Act of 1935 provided the framework. The directive principles of the Indian Constitution were evolved on the model of those in the Constitution of Eire. The idea of the fundamental rights was inspired by the Constitution of the U.S.A. The section of the Constitution dealing with the federation shows the influence of the Canadian pattern. Above all the Indian Constitution drew heavily from English principles and concepts, with which the framers were thoroughly acquainted.

It is impossible to analyse here in any satisfactory manner the Constitution of India containing 396 articles and numerous schedules. But we may in a broad manner say that it has to be

read, interpreted and understood not merely in terms of its own express texts but also in terms of the unwritten conventions as expounded in English constitutional law. The constitution may not be quite perfect, but it has all the essentials necessary for making the fundamental law of the land extremely sound. This constitution is proudly regarded as the Charter of India's freedom. The new Constitution was enacted on 26 November 1949 and inaugurated with due solemnity on 26 January 1950, a day which has become memorable in the country's constitutional history as the Republic Day. One main characteristic feature of the constitution is that it has preserved the unity of India which may be regarded as a British heritage. Consistent with the needs of a developing country, where there are wide variations in social and economic conditions of the people, the constitution gives all residuary powers to the central government. The Preamble to the Constitution represents the sincere aspirations of the noble framers and reads thus :

> WE THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC and to secure to all its citizens :
>
> JUSTICE, social, economic and political ;
> LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship ;
> EQUALITY of status and opportunity; and promote among them all ;
> FRATERNITY assuring the dignity of the individual and unity of the Nation ;
>
> IN OUR CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY this twenty-sixth day of November 1949, do HEREBY ADOPT, ENACT AND GIVE TO OURSELVES THIS CONSTITUTION.

This Preamble assures to all alike justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. The primacy given to justice should be noted. This does not find a place in the revolutionary slogans of France. It is in consonance with the ancient spirit of India, according to which the maintenance of *Dharma* is the supreme duty of the state. This concept of *Dharma* has of course been transformed

into the Rule of Law to ensure social and political justice, necessitated by the composite character of the Indian population.

There is a whole chapter on fundamental rights in the constitution. Its place in the constitution is questioned by some. The directive principles of state policy are regarded merely as a revised edition of the Congress Party's manifesto. There are some who maintain that Article 19 envisaging limitation on the enjoyment of certain freedoms by the citizens constitutes the the negation of the very principles underlying the exercise of fundamental rights.

Certain differences between the Indian Parliamentary system and that of the British may be pointed out here. The minister in the Indian Parliament can go to either house, and take part in the discussion, but his vote is confined to the house to which he has been elected. But no British minister belonging to the House of Lords can go to the House of Commons for similar purpose. The Attorney General in India is appointed by the President of India; he renders legal advice to government, untrammelled by personal and party consideration, whereas the Attorney General in Britain is a member of the cabinet conscious of the fact that he owes his position to the party in power. The Election Commission in India is an independent body which can be fair, free and impartial, because it is not a creature of the parliament or the executive. The five general elections for parliamentary seats in India based on adult franchise have clearly shown the soundness of the Indian arrangement for election. In Britain the responsibility for holding the election rests with the Parliament. But it must be observed that the British sense of fair play is never more strongly evident than in an election. In India the Parliament is not supreme in the sense in which it is in the United Kingdom. The judiciary here can pronounce invalid any act of Parliament that offends the constitution. For example, the Parliament is debarred from enacting legislation to compel a person to give evidence against himself or to allow a child under fourteen to work in a factory or mine, or to appropriate revenue to the propagation of any particular religion. In the United Kingdom, Parliament could, if it chose, do all these things.

The predominance of the centre is assured in three ways. First, the legislative powers of the centre and the state are enumerated in the federal, concurrent, and state list. It is specifically stated that residuary powers reside in the union. The federal government has wide powers of intervening in state's matters and in some circumstances of assuming the entire functions of any or all the state governments. Such actions have, however, to be approved by the Parliament within a limited time. Secondly, defence, international relations, ports, railways and currency are the prerogative of the centre alone. In the case of ports and aerodromes the central government can modify or supersede legislation, whether enacted by the centre or the states. The states, however, possess considerable powers over agriculture, education, law and order, etc. The states have sometimes asserted their rights in subjects in their charge; for example, in 1954 they resisted the attempts of the central finance minister to bring about some uniformity in the administration of states' sales taxes. In spite of the advice of the central government against prohibition, some states are following the policy of prohibition. Where the state government expects financial assistance from the centre it has necessarily to be more pliable than it would wish. Percival Griffiths observes : "In reality the relations between the states and the centre depend more on politics and personalities than on legal definition and some observers doubt whether the ascendency of the centre will be maintained, when Nehru ceases to be the Prime Minister." After Nehru, although the states have shown greater freedom in their expression of opinion regarding their relations with the centre, the relationship between the two has so far been smooth and cordial. Perhaps it is too early to come to a decision on the matter.

In India the judiciary has a right to overrule parliamentary authority. The judges of the supreme and high courts in India have courageously maintained their independence. The fundamental rights in the constitution are enforceable by law, while the directive principles cannot be so enforced. Certain conflicts have arisen between the approach of the fundamental rights and that of the directive principles. The Madras Government in its

attempt to improve the position of the backward classes reserve seats for them in certain educational institutions. The Supreme Court held that this amounted to discrimination and was therefore unconstitutional. But the Government of India felt that the action to uplift the backward sections of the community could not be against the spirit of the constitution. Therefore, the government secured an addition to Article 15, specifically permitting the state to make special provision for the advancement of the backward classes. Articles relating to the freedom of the press have also been amended, in consonance with the view of the central government. This has aroused bitter controversy. One of the most important safeguards of the constitution was embodied in Article 31; this lays down that a law providing for compulsory acquisition of property must fix the amount of compensation, or specify the principles on which the property is sought to be acquired. The Congress Government in pursuance of its policy of the abolition of the zamindars and landlords passed laws in the state legislatures for the state acquisition of property. In Bihar, the Patna High Court held that the Act concerned was unconstitutional in as much as it involved discrimination between one class and another. The constitution had therefore to be amended to enable the government to implement their policy of agrarian reform. This fourth amendment of the Constitution barred the courts from examining the adequacy of the compensation specified in any law for the acquisition of the property and in some important cases relieved the state of the constitutional obligation to pay compensation for the acquisition of rights or property. Nehru's policy of attaching greater importance to directive principles than to constitutional safeguards was viewed with deep concern by the people of India. To some extent it shook the confidence of the world at large.

It may be observed that for over 150 years now there have been only 25 amendments to the Constitution of the U.S.A., whereas the Indian Constitution has already been amended 32 times. There is pressure brought to bear on the government for amending the clause of the constitution relating to the use of Hindi as official language. A commission was appointed to

study and report on the question of replacing of English by Hindi. Their report is noncommital, for they expressed no view as to when Hindi should replace English as official language. But Nehru made statesman-like pronouncement that English would continue as "an associate additional language as long as the people required and there would be no imposition of Hindi on non-Hindi speaking people". The Shastri government adhered to this and so does Indira Gandhi's government.

Some Constitution Amendment Acts of the Parliament were challenged through writ petitions in the Supreme Court (Vide Appendix B). A Bench consisting of thirteen judges was constituted to hear the petitioners' arguments and the counter-arguments of the legal representatives of the Government of India. The thirteen judges were unanimous in revising the earlier ruling in what is known as the Golaknath Case and upholding the power of the Parliament to amend any part of the Constitution, thereby validating the 24th Amendment of the Constitution. It is important to note that nine judges have given the above ruling with the vital reservation that the power to amend even the fundamental rights does not enable Parliament "to alter the basic structure or framework of the Constitution". This gives the citizen the right to go to the Supreme Court whenever the executive or Parliament undermines any basic right granted by the Constitution. Time alone can show how far this limitation can safeguard the fundamental rights of the citizen.

Enthusiasts of parliamentary supermacy attempt to restrict the jurisdiction of the judiciary and take away or abridge the fundamental rights. According to K. Subba Rao, formerly Chief Justice of India: "The emotional slogan of Parliament's superiority is an attack on the Constitution itself, for, a Constitutional democracy, by definition, is a limited form of government."

On the doctrine of committed judiciary he states that it "is a concept of totalitarian ideology and is out of place in a democratic policy". Other retired judges of the Supreme Court share this view.

The establishment of Planning Commission to formulate Five-Year Plans, and Indian National Development Council consist-

ing of the chief ministers of the states among others tended to increase the power of the central authority. All these subjects are enumerated in the union list besides such unshared powers. The centre has concurrent jurisdiction over a number of other subjects. Where there is a difference of opinion between the centre and the state, the law requires that the Centre's will should prevail.

The greatest merit of the Indian Constitution consists in the fact that it is an Indian statute although it has borrowed some elements from other constitutions. The vision and boldness of the founding fathers of the constitution may be seen from the abolition of the electoral system of communal representation and the preservation of the security of the state.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Domestic Policy and Party Politics

IN BRITISH INDIA direct chain of authority descended from the King Emperor, through the Viceroy and Provincial Governor to the District Officer, and the British Parliament had the supreme control over the government and its machinery. All this changd with independence. After independence till the first general election in 1951-52 power was vested in the Cabinet. Jawaharlal Nehru, admittedly the most powerful political figure in India, was the Prime Minister. Western writers, while conceding that the scheme of responsible government through the ministers is quite well understood by the educated middle class in India, doubt if the cultivator can easily understand it. We have already indicated that entrusting responsibility to selected or elected representatives has long been known to India. Elections to the district board and municipalities had already familiarized the peasant with independent India's form of government. Hence, it may be said that free India had a tradition of responsible gov-

ernment in a measure which no other country in Asia could claim at the time of independence.

Lord Mountbatten who had played a major part in bringing about transfer of power agreed to remain as the first Governor General of independent India till June 1948. Mountbatten was really admired and trusted by Nehru and his colleagues in Cabinet. He was loved by the people as the connecting link between Britain and free India. He took a leading part in trying to compose the growing differences between India and Pakistan. By his innate nobility and his enthusiasm for right causes, this scion of royal lineage has won an abiding place in the history of free India. Lady Mountbatten was really a sister of mercy in the unhappy days of partition and her death in February 1960 was deeply mourned in India.

The man to decide the future of the country was Jawaharlal Nehru. His biography has to be read elsewhere. The sacrifices of the Nehru family for the cause of India's freedom endeared Jawaharlal to the people of India. He was born of a very rich Kashmiri Brahmin family and was educated at Harrow and Cambridge in England. He was the very embodiment of a wholesome combination of the best in India and in England. Right through his life there was a conflict in him between his loyalty to the spiritual ideals of India and his love for the dazzling material progress of the West. Like Gandhiji, Nehru had a certain enigmatic quality defying the analysis even of the most careful observer. By temperament he was at once a democrat and a dictator. Everyone who knew him realized his greatness and singleness of purpose. He had a genuine desire for the welfare of the masses and very much enjoyed the presence of ordinary folk. Indeed he drew spiritual refreshment through contact with the crowd. Like a magnet he drew unimaginably large crowds wherever he went. By his deep scholarship and extensive travels he had acquired a rare insight into human nature. No wonder that he was the idol of the nation. He was second to none in the world in democratic leadership. No one in recent history had continuously held the premiership of a democratic country for seventeen years as Nehru did. It cannot, however, be said that he had the unanimous support of the intelligentsia in all the details of his domestic

and foreign policy. When in 1956 he did not express the indignation of the Indian public at Russia's behaviour in Hungary, he was subjected to severe criticism. Again in 1959 when China made deep incursions into Ladakh his reluctance to condemn China raised a storm in the Lok Sabha. Discerning people in India felt that he had been duped by China. While his brilliant intellect and sincerity of purpose were greatly admired, his lack of grit as an administrator was deplored. Even as a party chief he was not as efficient as people wished him to be. Nevertheless, his personality was power, and his very frailties won for him the love and regard of the common people. There is no gainsaying the fact that progressive India owes a great deal to Nehru's genius and vision.

From August 1947 to 27 May 1964 Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister of India. Lal Bahadur Shastri, a trusted friend and colleague of Nehru, succeeded him as the Prime Minister on 11 January 1966. Lal Bahadur Shastri died when he was at Tashkant in a conference with the Pakistan President over the question of Kashmir dispute. Then Indira Gandhi, daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru, became the Prime Minister. At the Centre since independence the Congress has been continuously having a clear majority in the parliament to run the government. Lal Bahadur followed Nehru in his policy. Indira Gandhi has been trying to give a new orientation to socialism and attempting to quicken the pace of social justice.

The Constitution of India was finalized on 26 November 1949 and the Republic of India was inaugurated with due solemnity on 26 January 1950. At that time India was politically immature, socially backward and economically poor as already indicated. Nehru had to implement the following directives laid down in the Constitution :

The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing

(*a*) that the citzens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood ;

(*b*) that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve

the common good ;

(c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.

What was India like in respect of food and clothing after partition? Agriculture, though the most important, was in some ways the least satisfactory branch of the Indian economy. India was unable to feed herself, though she had an irrigated area three times as large as that of the U.S.A. and larger than the combined total of any other ten countries in the world. It must be pointed out that India's ability to feed herself was substantially lessened by partition, for sixty-eight per cent of the irrigated area of undivided India went to Pakistan, According to C. N. Vakil, yields of rice and wheat in India were only 750 and 650 lb. respectively as against 900 and 850 lb. in Pakistan. Consequently, India with a proportionately larger population had to experience shortage of food.

The effect of partition on textile industries was equally serious. The jute mills were in India, while nearly eighty per cent of the raw jute was grown in the then East Pakistan. There was a compelling necessity for India to grow jute in land badly required for food production. Although the number of cotton textile mills was far larger in India than that in Pakistan, the latter had a much larger share of American type of medium-staple cotton. Thus Indian mills were deprived of an important market in West Pakistan where per capita consumption of cloth had been higher than elsewhere in undivided India.

In 1950-51 in India the per capita consumption level of food was 1,800 calories per day and of cloth 9.2 yards per capita per annum, both distressingly low.

At the time of partition India was comparatively well off in the matter of industrial establishment, for during the Second World War she was the base of military supplies for Middle East. She had a considerable number of experienced industrialists and financiers ; but even here there was shortage of mechanics owing to the migration of a large number of Muslim mechanics to Pakistan.

The aims of the domestic policy of Nehru were to increase production; to enthuse everyone to contribute his best to increase the national income; and to reduce as far as possible inequalities in the distribution of wealth. His policy contained no doctrinaire approach or a rigid pattern and its keynote was integration of various sections in the community and the removal of disparities and antagonisms.

Till 1951-52, Nehru's Cabinet included experienced statesmen and financial experts who were not members of the Congress. Their contribution to the successful administration of the country was really great. But after the first general elections in 1951-52, the Cabinet was formed on the basis of the party system, so that only Congressmen could find a place in it. In the early years of independence, the officers of the Indian Civil Service carefully adjusted themselves to the changed conditions and did their best to help maintain law and order and stability of administration. Somehow or other, it was felt that in the democratic set-up in the country new cadres should be formed for different branches of administration. These new officer shad to handle problems like the management of internal trade, finance, banking, insurance, control of vast industrial concerns and supervision of large welfare projects. Provision was made for recruitment to Indian administrative, railway, police, forest and other similar important services. The work of the Public Service Commissions grew greatly with the need to recruit more and more officers. The new services have grown largely under political control. How far considerations other than merit have weighed in the matter of appointments to high administrative posts is a matter for study. The allegation that the new officers have shown a bias for regionalism has also to be examined before it can be accepted.

The results of the first general elections were quite revealing. It was clearly demonstrated that there was no political organization of an all India character capable of offering an effective challenge to the supremacy of the Congress. The Congress had the advantage of possessing a well-knit countrywide organization with elected officers who had considerable influence over the electorate. So it continued to entrench itself in power. Only a

very small section of the community thought seriously over the question of effective opposition to the Congress. Splinter groups such as the Praja Socialists could show in their election manifesto nothing better than the socialist trends in the Congress. Only the Communist Party had the necessary organizational power to challenge the Congress but it miserably failed because its roots lay outside India and its arguments against the Congress were palpably fallacious. Its anti-God policy and its ideas about private property were not acceptable to the people at large. Moreover, its behaviour in the period of the Second World War, first opposing Britain for its imperialism and then supporting her war effort as soon as Russia became an allied power against Germany, seemed ridiculous to people. Its thoughtless criticisms of the Congress during the struggle for independence were regarded as anti-national. There are now two Communist Parties. Their common idealogy is the creation of a classless society and their strategy is more or less like the one followed by the Soviet Russia under Lenin and his successors and by Mao in China. The division of the party into a right and a left one in our country is really a division between those to whom Russia is a model to follow and those who swear by Mao's China. The Congress vigilantly watched the moves of the Communist Party and effectively checked its growth by exposing the dangers of its revolutionary campaign. Provincial political organizations such as the Hindu Mahasabha, Ganatantra Parishad, and Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam were all militant groups whose policies definitely tended to disrupt the unity of India and promote religious and communal discord, with the result that Congress emerged supreme in the Lok Sabha as also in State Assemblies except in Kerala. It is impossible to analyse the results of the elections in sufficient detail here. It should, however, be noted that the adult franchise led to the awakening of the masses. Rural interests asserted themselves. The state legislatures showed a sizeable bloc of representatives from rural areas. University men, lawyers and other professional groups were not generally favoured by the rural people. The educated middle class came to be less respected than in the days of British rule. The shift to local rural leaders irrespective of academic credentials or poli-

tical experience was clearly noticeable. This was not an unforeseen tendency in the process of Indian democracy.

'Nehru' became a name to conjure with and local Congress leaders made full use of it. Nehru, too, carried on a whirlwind election campaign for the Congress. There was some indefinable trait of character in Nehru which made even respectable leaders of the Congress not to say or do anything calculated to displease him. Not that Nehru wanted them to be subservient; he was too much of a democrat to do that. This kind of self-surrender on the part of the Congress leaders led some impartial observers feel that Nehru could, at any moment, turn a dictator, if he chose. So towering was his personality that foreigners interested in India kept asking what would happen to Indian leadership after Nehru.

To give concrete shape to the domestic policy based on the directive in the constitution, quoted earlier, planned development was started in 1951. Since then three Five Year Plans have been completed and we are now near the completion of the fourth Five Year Plan. The goals enshrined in the directive principles of the constitution have been spelt out as socialist pattern in the plans. The achievements of the plans will be dealt with later in the chapter on economic progress. In December 1954, the Parliament adopted the socialist pattern of society as the objective of social and economic policy. The socialist pattern of society means increased production, maximum contribution from every one towards national development and fair distribution to all concerned. It also involves the ownership or control by the state of basic industries, cooperative agriculture, and a tax system meant to ensure equitable distribution of wealth.

The Congress Socialist Party came into existence in 1934. Its members were responsible to ensure that the parent organization would develop a radical outlook on social and economic issues. Inspiration for their socialism came from the leaders like Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose. After attainment of national independence, the socialists as a group seceded from the Congress in 1948. This group could have developed into the second largest political party in the country, if there had been unity among its members. Unfortunately, they spent a great deal of their energy

and time in dialectical hair-splitting and failed to win a mass following. Jayaprakash Narayan, who was the leader of the party, became an ardent Gandhian after the Mahatma's death and disavowed politics altogether. Asoka Mehta, the next socialist leader, found that there was a good deal of common ground between the Congress and the socialists. So he accepted the Deputy Chairmanship of the Planning Commission of the Government of India. In 1952, the socialists merged with the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party and formed the Praja Socialist Party. For a brief period it had the leadership of men like Prakasam and Acharya Kripalani. Because the Congress stood for nationalism, secularism and socialism, the Praja Socialist Party had nothing better to show to capture the imagination of the people. The party has been languishing for want of both leaders and resources.

The Communist Party of India is the chief single opposition party. This party has been under vigorous attack since the first Chinese invasion in 1959 and especially since the more serious invasion of October 1962. In 1957 the Communist Party succeeded in forming the ministry in Kerala. It became also the chief opposition party in the legislatures of Andhra Pradesh, the Punjab, Madras and West Bengal. The membership of the Communist Party is not large. Its leaders are predominantly university graduates, belonging to the intelligentsia of India. The communists were in power in Kerala for twenty-eight months. In this period they provided an instructive glimpse of communist methods. Namboodiripad, the Chief Minister, proclaimed that in all industrial and agrarian disputes the police would remain neutral. This gave labour an advantage in dealing with their employers and resulted in an alarming growth of lawlessness in the state, particularly in the plantations. Most of the ministers were above corruption; but the party grew enormously rich at the cost of the state. The Education Bill of the Communist Party aroused wide opposition. This bill required even private schools to choose their teachers from lists prepared by the state. Control over education was increased, and nationalized textbooks were written with a view to indoctrinating the student population with the subversive doctrine of communism.

Those who opposed communist rule in Kerala were obliged to resort to civil disobedience. The Congress which was in opposition managed to bring about an intervention by the central government. Commenting on this K. M. Panikkar observes :

> ...without a breakdown such intervention would not be justified. So a breakdown had to be brought about. For this purpose organized direct action was resorted to. It was led by the Congress, under the authority of the Party High Command in Delhi, whose leaders continuously visited the State to give guidance to the agitation. That the Party High Command was in close association with the Central Government would hardly be denied. Having thus itself helped to create a political crisis in the State, the Central Government imposed the President's rule on the ground that there had been a breakdown of administration. The breakdown of administration was, if not created, at least promoted by the Central Government in order to enable it to give its intervention a legitimacy. In effect it was a reaffirmation of the doctrine of paramountcy.[1]

Elections were held in 1960 in which the Communists gained a few more seats than before. However, the Congress managed to form a coalition ministry with the Praja Socialist Party and the Muslim League. This encouraged the League in its communal activities and the Jana Sangh in the North hotly criticized the Congress.

The Jana Sangh was formed in 1951 under the leadership of the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee. This party claims to stand for "one country, one culture, one nation and *dharma raj* and rule of law". In its election manifesto of 1961, written before the Indian invasion of Goa, it urged "the complete integration of Kashmir", and "opposition to soft pedalling of disputes with Pakistan", and "the use of force to put an end to Portuguese colonial rule on

[1] *The Foundations of New India*, p. 240.

our soil". This manifesto further said that in "proper and quick industrialization, instead of copying Western pattern, we should develop our own technique...." This party emphasizes Indian self-sufficiency and urges greater independence of foreign capital and foreign aid. In the last general election this party won eighteen seats in the Lok Sabha, and one hundred and sixteen seats in the local legislatures. It has been putting forward an impatient demand on behalf of Hindi in opposition to English. Its following is mostly confined to the Hindi-speaking regions. In the last elections it fared disastrously in the rest of the country. This shows that its policies and programmes have not been sufficiently popularized. Its leader, A.B. Vajpayee, is an uncompromising critic of the Congress government. He says : "there should be no attempt on the part of the government to monopolize any trade. Monopoly leads to corruptions and inefficiency, and the losses will have to be borne by the tax-payer. Unless production is increased, distribution reformed and drastic economy effected in governmental expenditure, price cannot be stabilized."

The Swatantra Party was established in 1959. Its sudden rise is almost entirely due to the commanding influence of its founder C. Rajagopalachari, "a man of razor-like intelligence", according to Nehru. He was an elder statesman in Indian politics and most devoted adherent of Mahatma Gandhi. In spite of his great age, he had been opposing the Congress without rest and retirement. Writing in *Hindustan Times Independence Day Supplement*, he called the Congress Ministry corrupt, inefficient and unscrupulous. He stated : "There can be no fair election with the party in office, distributing permits and licenses and holding the power to ruin any man or any business." The opponents of the Swatantra Party often accuse it of being a close ally of big business and dispossessed princes. This party has certainly taken money from the wealthy class, but the Congress too has done the same. Among the present leaders of the Swatantra Party are N.G. Ranga, M.R. Masani and M. Ratnaswami, all men of character, worth and reputation. But this party fared badly in the last two elections. Nevertheless, there are people who desire that it should grow strong because there

is an urgent need for a rival political party that can offer an effective constitutional opposition to the Congress. As Kulkarni observes: "....the strength of the Congress party is not in itself, but in the weakness of its rivals." The parties ranged against the Congress are many, and they are too divided to function as a single body. Acharya Kripalani brought againt Nehru Ministry a 'no-confidence motion' in August 1963 in the Lok Sabha. This was defeated by 346 votes to sixty-one, the communists choosing to remain neutral. This demonstrates the irremovability of the party in power.

Minor political parties are far too many to be mentioned. The Akali Dal in Punjab, a communal party led by Master Tara Singh, agitated for a Sikh state and the state was divided into Punjab and Haryana on linguistic basis. In Madras the chief opposition party was the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (society for Dravidian uplift). It urged the secession of Dravidian South (Madras, Kerala, Mysore and Andhra Pradesh) from the rest of India. Its influence has been limited to Tamil Nadu (Madras); the Southern States have given no support to its aims. This party opposes the adoption of Hindi as the official national language. In 1962 election, this party captured fifty-three out of 206 seats in the state legislature. C.N. Annadurai, the leader of the party, demanded secession in parliament in May 1962. Prime Minister Nehru said that the demand was outrageous and that it should be resisted "with all our force". With the D.M.K. in mind the government drew up the sixteenth amendment to the constitution to permit restriction on freedom of speech and assembly in the interest of the "integrity and sovereignty of India". Under this amendment the candidates advocating secession would be prohibited from contesting the elections. The D.M.K. has now given up its demand for secession. C. Rajagopalachari's influence with the D.M.K. was considerable; in any event it was calculated to turn narrow communalism into broad nationalism. In 1967 elections the D.M.K. won a large majority and formed the State Government, and C.N. Annadurai, a leader of great integrity and broad outlook, became the Chief Minister; but unfortunately his leadership was shortlived owing to his premature death. The

D.M.K. leadership fell on the shoulders of M. Karunanidhi[3] who successfully piloted the party in 1971 elections and the party got an absolute majority in the State Legislature.

Nehru was determined to make India a secular state, in spite of the pressure brought up by Hindu communal organizations of the North. The opposition to the secular state came not only from the Hindus but from the aggressive Sikh community. Out of India's total population of 360 million in 1951 not less than thirty to thirty-five million were Muslims. The Christians numbered seven millions. There were also other religious communities. The policy of Nehru's government was to do everything possible to make these religious minorities feel secure in India. Therefore, Nehru was bent on retaining the composite character of India's political structure. It must here be pointed out that it is not derived from European traditions. The doctrine of a single community enjoying political power in the state is really a Christian conception developed in Europe. For a long time after the break with Rome, in England the Catholics were excluded from positions of power. It was little by little that the Catholics came to enjoy political rights with those belonging to the Anglican Church. Even now the British monarch should be of the Anglican Church. The militant Hindus in the North thought that it was possible to make India a Hindu state, and at the same time guarantee rights to the members of the minority communities. But the Indian concept of secular state postulates that political institutions must be based on the economic and social interests of the entire community without reference to religion, race or sect. No group has therefore been allowed any special right or privilege on the basis of religion. All communities therefore have to share the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. The fact that Pakistan is an Islamic state, where the Hindu minority is not given equal rights of citizenship with the Muslims, greatly exercised the minds, particularly of the members of the Jana Sangh Party. Well, whatever position

[3]Owing to sharp differences between M.G. Ramachandran, formerly Treasurer of the Party, and M. Karunanidhi, a split in the D.M.K. has recently taken place.

Pakistan might give to religious groups other than the. Muslims, India sticks to the principles of secular state, giving equal rights for all, irrespective of religion. This is no small achievement of Nehru.

One cardinal principle of Nehru's domestic policy was to maintain and increase the strength of the centre in relation to the states. While there was no unnecessary interference in the internal administration of the state, he took care to see that every state respected the authority of the centre.

After the death of Nehru, Kamaraj, among national leaders, rose to such prominence that he came to be called the 'king-maker' in India. It was largely through his diplomacy that Lal Bahadur Shastri came to be chosen unanimously as the Prime Minister. He had no mean share in getting Indira Gandhi elected to the Premiership of India which was hotly contested by Morarji Desai. Kamaraj, in co-operation with the then President of the Congress, Nijalingappa, and other elder statesmen tried to offer guide-lines for Indira Gandhi's administration. Indira Gandhi, who was bent on infusing fresh blood into the cabinet and satisfying the young radical socialists as far as possible, openly resented the patronizing attitude of the group of elders. At first she supported Sanjeeva Reddy, the official candidate of the Congress for the Presidentship of India in the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. Zakir Husain. Later, she resolved to go on her own and openly supported V.V. Giri, the rival candidate. This was resented by the elder statesmen. The Executive of the Congrees expelled her from the Congress for indiscipline. There was then a split in the Congress Party and the Congress M.P.s who were against Indira Gandhi took their seats in the opposition. With undaunted courage and indomitable will, Indira Gandhi continued to be the Premier of India with the majority of the Congress members in the parliament supporting her. However, she brought about the dissolution of the parliament and arranged for fresh elections, so that she could get a clear mandate from the people. In the Fifth General Elections (1971) the Ruling Congress led by Indira Gandhi won 350 parliamentary seats as against 209 of the United Congress in 1967. Thus she came off with flying colours

with an absolute majority to support her in the Parliament. It must be said that Indira Gandhi shines not in reflected glory but on her own right. Though there has been a noticeable departure in some aspects of the policies relating to social justice, she has been following the cardinal principles of the domestic policy of her illustrious father, Jawaharlal Nehru.

After the elections Indira Gandhi took care to form a Cabinet that would help the implementation of her socio-economic policies. The Central Secretariat has also been reformed for expediting government business.

Membership of the New Congress now means material advantages, the spoils of office, patronage and power. Charges of corruption are levelled against the ruling party. It is impossible to say whether there is, in fact, more corruption in India than in other countries. Maybe that the critic's expectation of honesty in government "is greater than human nature can maintain".

CHAPTER TWELVE

Foreign Policy

IT MUST be admitted that in matters of diplomacy India was just a beginner at the time of independence. The British authorities had not employed Indian officials in any worthwhile diplomatic missions. It was, however, fortunate that India's destiny lay in the hands of Jawaharlal Nehru, who was not only the Prime Minister but also Minister for Foreign Affairs. By his deep study, frequent and extensive travels and thorough grasp of geopolitics, he was eminently fit for shaping the foreign policy of India. The question often raised is: "Has India a clear-cut positive foreign policy?" It is difficult to answer this question; for, the foreign policy of any nation is basically the pursuit and assurance of fundamental national interests abroad by peaceful means. In a developing country like India, domestic and foreign policies can function only in unison and in a complementary way. The approach to other countries varies with the extent to which they respond to India's friendliness and goodwill. India's main aim is to secure in as short a time as possible the industrial development and economic improvement

which took the West more than a century of conflict.

The international situation at the time when India becam independent was very complex. As a result of the Second Worl War nine new communist regimes had come into existence. Chin embraced communism. Soon ideological defection of Yugoslavia China and Albania from Russia came into evidence. Thes countries refused to toe the Moscow line in toto. The unpredictable nature of the policies of Russia and China caused grav concern to people all the world over on the issues of peace an freedom. Russian expansionist policy in Eastern Europe an her treatment of East Germany in her possession alarmed th Western democracies. So the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to contain Communism in Europe and the South East Asia Treaty Organization to do the same in Asia were formed unde the leadership of U.S.A. While Russia showed an aggressive and subversive form of international communism in Eastern Europe, China was fully equipped with Army, money and industrial power to pose a threat to the World. A novel feature in international politics after the Second World War was the logistics of the cold war.

The U.S.A began to play a positive role in Asian affairs only after India became free and Indonesia was sought to be forced back into slavery by the Dutch. But her role was rather pragmatic than based on the application of any well-defined principle. The charge often made against the U.S.A. was that while she claimed the right and duty to protect the whole of the new world from outside and alien influences, she was practising a kind of imperialism in all of Latin America. It was Roosevelt and to a lesser extent Kennedy that stood for a global policy based more or less on the universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the United Nations. The world stood divided into two blocs, the Communist bloc headed by Russia and the Western democracy led by the U.S.A. The United Nations has been trying to bridge the gulf between the East and the West. But often the members of the Security Council have found it impossible to act in concert. India as a member of the U.N. has been cooperating with the other members for the promotion of international peace. But Nehru in a foreign policy debate (in June

1962) in Parliament felt compelled to observe that the United Nations was gradually becoming "a protector of colonialism".

It is a regrettable fact that India's relations with her neighbours are not altogether friendly. India's attitude towards all nations is one of peace and friendliness, but her neighbours have their own policies. Pakistan ever since its inception has been treating India as inimical to her. Jinnah's distrust and suspicion of India appears to be the legacy of Pakistan. The unfounded fear is that India would make it impossible for Pakistan to survive as an independent country. Pakistan is guided by alignment with the U.S.A and the military aid that she has received from the U.S.A. has only encouraged her to disregard India's approaches for good neighbourliness. Communist China does not like the planned economy of democratic India. India is demonstrating that a democracy could profit by planned economy. Ceylon has both economic and race problems of her own, and wants the Indian residents there to migrate to India. The Commonwealth countries are obsessed by their own problems and India does not generally figure significantly in their discussions. Burma's policy of nationalization has resulted in the loss of Indian concerns and property in that land and has led to the migration of Indians who had settled there. It cannot be said that India and her neighbours have as yet fully reconciled themselves to the situation that has been developing since 1947.

India's foreign policy has to be understood in the light of the situation described above. Before we proceed to discuss India's relations with individual countries, we would like to mention the genesis of India's policy of non-alignment. Conditions of cold war have been prevailing since the end of Second World War; the NATO and SEATO powers are aligned against the Communist bloc; undeclared wars have become common. Nehru sincerely believed that joining any bloc meant supporting war. His most important concern was to make India retain the freedom she had won. He thought involvement in the conflict of the power blocs would be harmful to India. So he boldly declared that his policy was non-alignment. This is often called neutralism, which implies indifference or inaction

towards mutually opposed nations. Nehru vehemently objected to such a description of his policy. He made it clear that his non-alignment meant freedom to judge right and wrong in a situation and support the right. India's non-alignment is therefore not a negative neutralism. When two great power blocs stood in opposition to each other, he believed that there must be a third party for mediation and counsel which could serve as a bridge between the two blocs. It was his firm belief that India could be the spearhead of such a body and work for international peace. Most of the free states of Asia and Africa appreciate the policy of non-alignment and support it. They are no doubt economically and militarily weak, but it is a matter of no small importance that they represent large groups of people in the world. Another thing that should be made clear is that Nehru had no intention of becoming an Asian or Afro-Asian leader. He was conscious of the fact that India's influence in international affairs was comparatively little. Indeed, at one time he rebuked some of his followers when they talked as if India really counted in world affairs. Nevertheless, after independence India did really loom large in the eyes of both the blocs; Western democracies were interested in the development of democratic institutions in India. The Communist bloc was interested in the adoption of Five Year Plans for social justice and economic improvement.

In the days of the premiership of Indira Gandhi the world situation has changed from what it was in her father's time, making it impossible to stick to any well-defined principle in shaping the foreign policy of India. Mutual fear and the grinding burden of the arms race have driven Russia and the USA to enter into talks for limitation of strategic armaments. Bilateral talks of the USA with China show that both the countries can by-pass India in the South-East Asian region. Before the detente with Russia, the USA needed Pakistan for a jumping off ground to Russia. Now she needs Pakistan only to check effectively the growing political power of India. It is economic power that largely determines the extent of political power of a country. The economic development of India continues to depend to some extent on aid from the developed

countries. Withdrawal or suspension of aid is a weapon that a super power uses to keep a militarily weak country as its camp follower. However, there are a good number of major and minor powers that look up to India for a lead to keep the Indian Ocean area free from the contest of super powers for supremacy. Some countries aligned with the USA feel that their advantage lies in preventing India from developing into a major power. Japan, though small in area, has perhaps the greatest economic power among Asian nations and is capable of building up military strength to be a threat even to so-called super powers. The shaping of the foreign policy of India has to be viewed in the above context as well as the changing situation caused by the emergence of Bangladesh as an independent country.

India and Pakistan. The relations between India and Pakistan have belied the hope that suspicion and bitterness might gradually fade away. There were three controversial issues between India and Pakistan, namely Kashmir, evacuee property and river waters. The Pakistan part of the Punjab depends very largely on irrigation for cultivation. As the result of partition twenty-one million acres of irrigated area of the Punjab went to Pakistan as against five million acres in India. The upper regions of the rivers flowing into Pakistan lay in Indian territory. Pakistan feared that India's own need to increase her irrigation facilities might leave Pakistan short of water. Moreover, some of the Pakistan canals have their headworks in Indian territory. India could, if she wished, divert these canals and cut off supply of water to Pakistan. Soon after partition India and Pakistan entered into a stand-still agreement according to which the same proportions of the waters of the rivers would be allowed to flow downstream into Pakistan as before partition. This agreement lapsed on 31 March 1948, and disputes arose between the two countries over the question of sharing water. The World Bank offered its good offices to work out a settlement. Eugene Black, the President of the World Bank, and David Lilienthal of the Tennessee Valley Authority of the U.S.A. brought about an amicable settlement in September 1960. The Indus Water Treaty as it is called divides the total waters of the Indus system in the proportion of 80:20 between

Pakistan and India. The construction of the link canals, and other necessary works were estimated to cost Rs. 500 croes. The World Bank, the U.K., the U.S.A., and other friendly countries offered loans for the engineering works which, it was reckoned, would take ten to thirteen years for completion.

The disposal of the property of the millions of people who had abandoned their homes was another difficult problem. It is not necessary to trace the history of many discussions in detail. Pakistan realized that under any arrangement she would have to pay a considerable amount of money to India and this she was not prepared to do. The evacuee problem, therefore, has greatly embittered relations between the two countries.

Pakistan determined to set up her own jute mills and deprive Calcutta of raw jute. As already indicated India planned a considerable increase of jute cultivation. The Government of Sind placed drastic restrictions on the removal of commodities by Hindu emigrants to India from the province. India replied by threatening to withhold the cash balances due to Pakistan under the financial arrangements between them. However, wiser counsels prevailed and both the countries signed important trade agreements (June 1948).

In September 1949 Britain and India devalued their currencies, but Pakistan decided to maintain the value of her rupee which in effect made her economic arrangement with India meaningless. India refused to recognize the Pakistan rupee at its own value or indeed at any value at all. No monetary transaction was possible between the two countries and trade was at a complete stand-still. The conflict became particularly bitter, when Pakistan refused to allow the export to India of jute fully paid for before devaluation. Thereupon India stopped supply of coal to Pakistan. By April 1950, however, both Delhi and Karachi recognized that neither country could withstand the loss resulting from the trade deadlock, and in February 1951 there was a trade agreement between the two countries. India recognized the par value of the Pakistan rupee and the devaluation war was at an end. In July 1955 Pakistan devalued her rupee to the Indian level and this further eased the strain.

While these disputes between India and Pakistan have been

settled in a way, the Kashmir problem continues to give trouble. We have already referred to the circumstances under which Kashmir acceded to India. The U.N. tried to bring about an agreement between India and Pakistan, but failed. Demilitarization was considered essential by the U.N. Pakistan would not withdraw her forces unless India at the same time withdrew her forces on her side of the line. India insisted on Pakistan's withdrawal first as she was the aggressor. Further, India was not prepared to leave Kashmir unprotected or ungoverned by withdrawing her forces completely from Kashmir. It was suggested that a U.N. force composed of contingents from European or American countries should hold Kashmir, pending a plebiscite. Nehru objected to this as it would mean a reversion to European domination. He, however, expressed his willingness to settle the Kashmir question by the partition of the state along the cease-fire line. Pakistan hoped that in a plebiscite the Muslim population would vote for Pakistan and so refused to agree to this compromise. During his tour of India in December 1955 Khrushchev clearly said that the plebiscite was unnecessary and that Kashmir belonged to ndia. On the ground that U.S. military aid to Pakistan had altered the situation, Nehru rejected the possibility of a plebiscite. India went ahead with a number of development projects in Indian-held Kashmir. A Kashmir Constituent Assembly was formed. This assembly duly voted for the incorporation of Kashmir into India from 26 January 1957. Sheikh Abdullah who had been Prime Minister of Kashmir from 1947 to 1953 favoured either independence or greater autonomy for his state. He did not want Kashmir to be incorporated into India. As he gave trouble he was put in prison. Pakistan regards the issue of Kashmir as one of prestige. She is unable to reconcile herself to the idea that the Muslim majority area should join India. Western nations who favour Pakistan are unable to understand that as a secular state India cannot allow religion to play a part in the settlement of the issue. Kashmir is regarded by Indians as a test of the very basis of the Indian nation. If India should yield to the demand for a plebiscite, it would lead to a lot of communal trouble in India. Already India is experiencing a lot of worries in Nagaland. A plebiscite

in Kashmir would mean only multiplying such troubles in India. After Kashmir was incorporated into India, Sheik Abdullah was released. He went on a European tour but abused the privileges of Indian citizenship. He was therefore forced to return to India and when he came he was interned for some time. He is now a free man again and the government of India has been holding talks with him on the Kashmir problem.

Pakistan has been keeping the Kashmir issue alive and constantly threatening India with *Jehad* (Holy War). Perhaps this is necessary to divert her people's attention from internal politics that are not altogether reassuring. In the former East Pakistan, there was a sizeable minority of Hindus who by force of circumstances were compelled to leave their homes and seek safety in India. There was also infiltration of Pakistani Muslims into the Indian territory to give trouble to the Government of India. Pakistan entered into a boundary treaty with China, giving away territory to which India has a claim. Her alliance with China emboldened her to follow a more aggressive policy towards India. She crossed the boundary line and occupied a few places in the Rann of Kutch and compelled India to take military action in defence. It appeared that India and Pakistan were on the brink of war, when fortunately Harold Wilson, Prime Minister of England, used his influence at the time of Commonwealth Conference in London in 1965 and brought about a ceas-fire agreement. Unless Pakistan reconciles herself to Kashmir's accession to India, there seems to be no hope of establishing cordial relations between her and India.

The Indo-Pak conflcts of 1965 and 1971 will be dealt with later in a separate chapter.

Relations with China. In the early years of independence all-out friendship with China was the cornerstone of India's foreign policy. She repeatedly sponsored the claim of Communist China to the Chinese seat in the United Nations. There were friendly official visits and exchange of cultural delegations between the two countries. But in the autumn of 1962 India's feelings of friendship and admiration gave place to anger and fear. Nehru awoke to see that he had been treacherously lulled into a false sense of security by the Chinese leaders. The

first sign of trouble came when India discovered early in 1950 that Chinese maps included in Chinese territory large areas that really belonged to India. When this was pointed out the Chinese explained it away saying that the maps antedated the Communist regime and that they had had no time to re-examine them. Again in 1950 trouble arose over Tibet. The British regarded Tibet as a buffer state between Russia, China and India and so in 1904 secured special privileges. They had the right to keep military contingents in the town of Gyantse and to maintain political and trade agents in Tibet, as well as postal and telegraph facilities. Independent India inherited these privileges. Theoretically it must be admitted that Tibet belonged to China, but had always been enjoying autonomy. Till 1950 China had made no attempt to exercise her sovereignty over Tibet; in that year Communist China sent in an occupying force. This of course caused concern to the Government of India. China disregarded India's official protests. Finally, in 1954 India recognized China's sovereignty over Tibet in a treaty which confirmed the Indian pilgrimage and trade rights. The preamble to this treaty embodied Nehru's famous *Panch Shila* (Five principles of Peaceful Co-existence) namely, mutual respect of territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence. The Chinese respected the terms of the treaty till 1959. Before then, however, in 1957 the Indian Government discovered that the Chinese had built a road across the Aksai Chin of Ladakh, and felt greatly perturbed. Ladakh, a remote rugged and uninhabitable region, was conquered by the Hindu Maharaja of Kashmir in the mid-nineteenth century. But being separated by high mountains from the rest of Kashmir, Ladakh had not received due attention from the British Indian Government and the Nehru Government did not think it worth risking a breach with China. But when the line around Ladakh had been marked on British maps in the early decades of the twentieth century, Tibet recorded a protest claiming the territory as hers. In the spring of 1958 the Indian Government sent two detachments to examine the new Chinese road in the Aksai Chin area; one detachment was captured by the Chinese

and India protested in vain. Nehru entered into correspondence over the matter with Chou-En-lai. Meanwhile the Chinese tightened their hold over Tibet. A revolution broke out on 20 March 1959. The Dalai Lama, the supreme temporal and ecclesiastical power of the state, fled to India followed by thousands of Buddhist refugees. Stories about the ruthlessness and brutality of the Chinese in Tibet spread and they were later confirmed by the International Commission of Jurists. A revulsion of feeling against the Chinese arose among the Hindus and Buddhists in India. While anger was mounting, towards the end of 1959 China began to encroach on Indian territory in the North East. While there may be reasonable doubt about the boundary line in Ladakh, the McMahon line in North East Assam was well defined. The denial of the validity of the McMahon settlement by the Chinese was nothing short of dishonesty. Further, the Chinese troop dispositions in the area of encroachment really threatened Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan. This awoke Nehru to the realities of the danger and for the first time he spoke bluntly of Chinese aggression and warned China that any encroachment on the three Himalayan states would be resisted by India, with force if necessary. When the opposition members in the Parliament urged Nehru to take the strongest possible action to drive China out of all Indian territory Nehru counselled moderation saying : "To imagine that India can push China about is silly. To imagine that China can push India about is equally silly. We must accept things as they are.... It is fantastic to talk about war." Nehru hoped to settle the matter by negotiation. But he failed miserably and in 1960 he publicly admitted that the Chinese claimed sovereignty of over 52,000 square miles of Indian territory and had occupied 14,000 square miles of the total, most of it in Ladakh. Two years passed. There was no sign of the Government of India having fully realized the seriousness of the Chinese danger in difficult mountainous region. The Chinese were well equipped for mountain warfare and had made careful preparation for their aggressive design. India's northern frontier is about 2,600 miles long. It is indeed impossible to guard such a long boundary "solidly and in depth". The invaders from the north are in an advantageous

position for they can choose their own striking point. The defending army has enormous difficulty to move its contingents and supply services to attack the enemy. In some places transport can be had only by air. Even helicopters give trouble in the mountain air.

The Chinese were not slow to take advantage of the inherent weakness of the Indian defence. In Ladakh they rapidly seized more area than they had previously claimed. In the North East Frontier Agency they came down the mountain slopes in several places. It was clear that their design was to capture the entire valley of the Brahmaputra and the important oil fields of Assam. Indian soldiers had neither the equipment necessary for mountain warfare nor had they even winter clothing, nor were they sufficiently strong in number to check the Chinese advance. On 29 October 1962, Nehru sent urgent requests to the United States and the United Kingdom for military aid and both the countries readily and generously responded. Nehru hoped to get help from Russia also. The promised MIG fighter planes did not come in the hour of need. Some of them appear to have been sent too late for use. The non-aligned Afro-Asian countries. remained non-aligned in the hour of India's need and counselled negotiation for cease-fire. The Chinese, perhaps because they had occupied what they had wanted to, or because of the consequences of the military aid of the U.S.A. and U.K. and the possible Russian aid to India, suddenly on 21 November made a unilateral offer of a cease-fire. There was a difference of opinion between India and China over the line to which the Chinese should withdraw. Without any agreement on the matter both sides stopped fighting and the Chinese pulled back much as they had promised, but not as India had demanded.

The six Colombo Powers (Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, Cambodia, the United Arab Republic and Ghana) negotiated for long to bring about a settlement between China and India, but failed owing to the uncompromising attitude of China over relinquishing a large part of the newly occupied territory. The answer to the question whether the India-China border dispute will ever be peacefully settled can only be conjectural at present. The Chinese aggression brought out clearly the need for strengthen-

ing India's defence and rethinking her foreign policy, partly based on non-violence. The readiness of the help rendered by the members of the commonwealth of nations showed the bond of friendship and union among them. The U.S.A. aided India from a genuine desire for the preservation of the democratic set up in India. Locally, all the political parties in India forgot their petty differences and stood united to meet the Chinese aggression, only the communists were divided in their loyalties.

The surprise Chinese attack revealed clearly how the Chinese soldiers had been thoroughly trained for mountain and jungle warfare and how effective their modern military equipment was. The Chinese intelligence service was superb and their communications excellent. To her distress India found that there were fifth columnists who ably assisted the Chinese.

Although ill-equipped and unprepared for war, the Indian soldiers fought bravely and inflicted heavy casualties on the Chinese. It became plain that the greatest need of India's defence services was modern arms and equipment. V. K. Krishna Menon, the Defence Minister, was no doubt a man of great experience in foreign affairs and of outstanding ability. But his tenure of office was regarded as a national misfortune. He had played politics with the defence services and was held responsible for India's debacle in the Chinese war. He was relieved of his office and Y. B. Chavan, the Chief Minister of Maharastra, was offered the defence portfolio. The defence position was studied carefully and it was agreed that first priority should be given to the equipment of the army and in particular to the provision of mountain warfare equipment.

Nehru's policy or non-alignment came in for criticism. There was, however, agreement in knowledgeable circles that it was sound. Alignment with Russia or U.S.A. would bring no tangible good to India, for what hope was there for an admittedly poor country like India to make her voice effectively felt in international politics. It was pointed out that Nehru's non-alignment led the U.S.A. and U.K. to think that India was undependable in her relations with other countries. There was no doubt about that feeling, but it sprang not from the policy of non-alignment but from the nature of Nehru's utterances on

international issues such as America's intervention in the Cuban affair and Britain's action against Egypt over the Suez. Nehru was deliberately outspoken in the belief that democratic nations would appreciate and tolerate honest differences of opinion. But when their prestige was at stake, such utterances roused resentment in them.

China appears to entertain hopes of territorial acquisition in the North Eastern borders and in the Himalayan regions. She considers India as her rival in the Afro-Asian region. She is a nuclear power and has come to be regarded as a Colossus. In spite of overtures of friendship, she is stiff in her attitude towards India. She has been considerably strengthened by the American President's visit to Peking (1972). The U.S.A. had all along been opposing the entry of China into the U.N. but there was a sudden change in American policy. She has gone so far as to say that Taiwan which she has all along propped up against Mainland China is a part of China. China supported Pakistan in her war against India (December 1971) which went to the help of the East Pakistanis in their dire distress during their war of independence. China, however, refrained from helping Pakistan with men. She exercised her veto in the Security Council and stood against the admission of Bangladesh into the U.N. She has been cautious in her policy towards Bangladesh giving room for the suspicion that someday she hopes to win over Bangladesh to her side.

Relations with the Three Himalayan Border States. The three Himalayan border states are Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan. They were once called the "Hermit Kingdoms" because of their isolation. India's relations with Nepal were not quite cordial till recently. Nepal has an area of 54,000 square miles with a population of ten million. In race, religion, language, culture and tradition it has much in common with India. Nepal functioned only as a protectorate, not as a sovereign state during the British regime. From 1846 to 1951, Nepal was ruled by the Ranas, who were also the prime ministers. The Nehru government helped King Mahendra to terminate the long-established Rana regime. India helped Nepal to take its place among the free nations of the world in its own right. In 1951,

the king proclaimed constitutional monarchy. But in 1959, he dismissed his Cabinet, dissolved the Parliament, banned all political parties and assumed sole national leadership. Nehru was anxious that Nepal should retain parliamentary democracy and was reluctant to condemn Nepalese insurgents. Mahendra did not like Nehru's disapproval of his action. He visited Pakistan, signed a border agreement with China and arranged for the construction of a Chinese-aided road between Kathmandu, the capital of Nepal and Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. Chou-En-Lai proudly said that this was a bridge between China and India. The Chinese have handled King Mahendra with utmost delicacy. Nehru failed to win him over, because he interfered with the institutions of Nepal out of an abstract love for constitutional government. Fortunately, the state visit of Dr. Radhakrishnan, the Indian President, to Nepal in November 1963 and his frequent references to historic ties between the two countries have helped to improve the Indo-Nepalese relations, and they are now on a better footing and more friendly.

In view of China's open hostility to India there is a great need to strengthen India's ties with Nepal.

Sikkim is the smallest of the three Himalayan border states with an area of 2,800 square miles and a population of 200,000 mostly Buddhists of the Tibetan stock. It lies right across the main trade route from India to Lhasa and hence it is of strategic importance. A full scale attack of Communist China against India might well be made through Sikkim which is a protectorate of India with a Maharaja to rule over it. According to the treaty signed at Gangtok in 1950 India takes the responsibility for defence, external affairs and communications of Sikkim. India has been making grants to aid its development. There are now 740 miles of road and tracks and a ropeway twelve and half miles long linking Gangtok and Nathu La pass.

In February 1973, the general election was held for National Assembly. This was contested by three political parties the National Congress, the Janata Congress and the National Party. The first two merged themselves after the elections and demanded the abdication of the Chogyal, the ruler alleging that the election was rigged in favour of the National party which repre-

sented a minority. In April there was a serious revolt which led to the complete breakdown of law and order and the administration. Both the Chogyal and the opposition parties appealed to New Delhi for intervention. The Government of India took over the entire administration and restored law and order. In May there was complete accord between the ruler and the opposition parties on the democratic set up of the government. Both of them have agreed that India should have a larger say in the affairs of Sikkim. India accepted additional responsibilities like ensuring a good administration for the State and promoting the economic, political and social welfare of the people.

Bhutan which is six times the size of Sikkim is more closely connected with Tibet than with India, geographically and culturally. It is not easily accessible from India. The Indian Government has recently undertaken a road building programme to make access easier. According to the treaty of 1949 Bhutan will be guided in its foreign relations by the Government of India. Besides promising an annual subsidy of rupees five lakhs the Government of India retroceded to Bhutan thirty square miles of territory around Dewangiri which had been annexed by the British in 1865. "Any aggression against Sikkim and Bhutan will be considered aggression against India", said Nehru.

Relations with Afro-Asian States. To stimulate cooperation and promote mutual understanding among Asian and African nations was Nehru's policy. In March 1947, before India attained independence, he convened an Inter-Asian Relations Conference in Delhi, under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs. Twenty-five Eastern countries including the Soviet Union and Egypt attended the conference. Two years later, at the official level, he convened a similar conference. This was attended by representatives of nineteen Asian governments. This conference protested against the Dutch military action against Indonesian nationalists and asked the U.N. Security Council to order the complete independence of Indonesia within a year.

Nehru was one of the sponsors of the Bandung Conference of April 1955. Representatives of twenty-nine nations, including Communist China, attended this conference whose objective was

to bring Asian nations into harmony. Sukarno, the Indonesian President, in his inaugural address voiced an angry indictment of 'White' imperialism. He proudly claimed "this is the first international conference of coloured peoples in the history of mankind." Chou-En-Lai, the Communist leader, "a product of war, conspiracy and revolution", spoke about strict adherence to *Pancha Shila*. There appears to have been an inward personality clash among the important leaders. It was soon found that there was no unity among the nations at the conference. The non-aligned nations also were divided in their aims and objectives. There was estrangement between Malaya and Indonesia. The Arab countries headed by Iraq demonstrated their hostility to Israel. Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines and others refused to follow Nehru's lead on friendship with Communist China. The most hotly debated point was military alliance with the West. Among Afro-Asian countries the real national interests of neighbouring countries did not in any way coincide. However, Nehru's prestige among non-aligned countries rose. But not one of big nations assembled there could emerge as the unchallenged leader of the Afro-Asian group.

In September 1961, at Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia, a conference of heads of the non-aligned states was held. It was hoped that Marshall Tito's thesis that the future of mankind should not be allowed to lie in the hands of a few powers would be considered and a way to reach the goal would be chalked out, but nothing of the kind happened. The solidarity of non-aligned nations proved a myth. Irrespective of the results of those conferences, India's faith in the soundness of the policy of non-alignment has remained unshaken.

India has special problems with a number of Afro-Asian nations arising from the existence of sizeable Indian minorities in them. These overseas Indians consist of unskilled labourers on one hand and big bankers and merchants on the other. The citizens of the country in which the Indians live resent their presence among them, chiefly because of their enviable wealth.

Economic nationalism in Burma deprived Indians of their property rights and most of them returned to India as refugees. India did not officially protest against the expropriations. But

they added tension to her relations with Burma. However, India has managed to maintain good relations with the Government of Burma.

In the Indo-Pakistan conflict over the creation of Bangladesh as an independent country, Burma did not take sides. There is no evidence to show that Burma has been pro-Chinese. In fact, Communist insurrections in Burma were put down by the government. Burma is the gateway to China from India's North-East Frontier. The foreign policy of India is directed to maintenance of cordial relationship with Burma.

5. SOUTH EAST ASIA—INDO-CHINA

Apart from India, there are about 13 countries in South-East Asia including Bangladesh. Ever since the withdrawal of the French from Indo-China, there has been trouble in Vietnam. War broke out between the Communists in the north and non-communists in the south. The country was partitioned between them and an international commission consisting of Canada, Poland and India (chairman) was appointed to supervise the implementation of the Geneva arrangement (1954). But Vietnam became a field for the conflict of Big Powers. The North has been supported by China and Russia, and the South by the U.S.A. After ten years of the most cruel war in history, an uneasy truce has been brought about and Nixon has kept his election pledge to withdraw all American combat troops from Vietnam. But there has been no real reconciliation yet between the north and south Vietnamese regimes and both are maintaining large forces equipped with sophisticated weapons. One significant aspect of the latest truce agreement in Vietnam is that India has been shut out of any role in the settlement arrangements, a fitting reflection of the failure of her Vietnam policy.

Knowledgeable circles complain that in Vietnam, India failed to do the duty assigned to it. Indeed there is need for India to make known clearly her policy towards the countries in the South-East Asia, because of the colossal economic resources of the region exploited by the Big Powers competing with one another for spheres of influence in the Indian Ocean area.

The chief problem of the Ceylonese is to maintain their standard of living in the face of a rapidly increasing population. After independence group rivalries and conflicts developed between the Tamil-speaking Ceylonese and Sinhalese. Insufficient food production and scarcity of jobs accentuated the rivalry. At present there are roughly nine million people in Ceylon of whom about a million are Tamils. As jobs are not sufficient the Government of Ceylon has sought to reserve for the Ceylonese as many jobs as possible in all kinds of occupations by enforcing numerous restrictions on the non-Ceylonese residents there. This discrimination affects the domiciled Indians. The Ceylonese Indians may justifiably claim to have contributed very substantially to the economic development and prosperity of the Ceylonese. The notification that Sinhalese is the sole official language of the country has further exacerbated the feelings between the Sinhalese and the Tamils. There has so far been no satisfactory solution of the problems. Since 1948 "Ceylon's Indians have been progressively debarred from citizenship and franchise". An Indian by origin can only be regarded as Sinhalese if he has been born in Ceylon and can prove that he has had a family connection with Ceylon for two generations.

This vexed question was settled by the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of October 1964. Ceylon appeared to move closer to China by her barter agreements with that country on rubber and rice; at the same time she cultivated friendly relations with the Soviet Union and the countries of Ceylon Aid Consortium (six leading countries of the West and Japan). Some insurgent elements in Ceylon used violence "to cause chaos and confusion with a view to capturing power" and this led to the declaration of a state of emergency throughout the island (16 March 1971). India was one of the countries that helped the Ceylonese government to contain the insurgency.

India's relations with Indonesia were cordial till 1950, because of her championship of Indonesian independence. After independence, Sukarno, not content with following Nehru's lead, developed leadership ambitions of his own. Unfortunately he met with a sad end. It should be a matter of some concern

to India to know that the Indonesian Foreign Minister, Mr. Adam Malik, revealed at Singapore, on April 16, that Indonesia had rejected Soviet Russia's offer of a treaty on the lines of the Indo-Soviet Treaty.

India played a major part in preventing the struggle in Korea from developing into a major war. India's experience of intervention on behalf of the U.N. in the Congo was not happy; she was treated with discourtesy.

6. WEST ASIA

Arab Union. There are 14 Arab States. The people of all these countries are not Arabs. "It is certainly true that West Asia is Muslim but not Muslim in the sense that Islam is a monolithic religion. There are the Arab countries and Muslim non-Arab countries like Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan who have been traditionally anti-Arab. In Iran, they have never forgotten the Arab conquest. They have completely Persianized themselves."[1] Egypt is the main country interested in the Arab Union. In 1962 it did not call China an aggressor. India has been supporting the Arabs over Israel, yet they did not support India during the China and Pakistan wars. Afghanistan's interests clashed with Pakistan on the question of Pakhtoonistan. By its stand for the right of self determination for Pakhtoons, it was really an ally of India, but it was not possible to turn this to the advantage of India.

Relations with Russia. During Stalin's time Russians used to refer to India as a 'stooge' of the imperialists and capitalists. But soon after his death, Khrushchev decided to make friends with India, and invited Nehru to visit Moscow. Nehru accepted it and demonstrated that India had no antagonism towards Russia. His visit was a great success and led to a return invitation. Khrushchev and Bulganin visited India in December 1955. We have already referred to Khrushchev's forthright announcements on Goa and Kashmir which though pleasing to India were somewhat startling to the U.S.A. and U.K. But when Khrushchev made bitter speeches against the British the initial

[1] M.R.A. Baig's article in *India and the World* ed. by A.P. Jain, 1972, p. 87.

enthusiasm for Russian leaders somewhat cooled down. In 1955 India was in no sense pro-Russian. But the Western nations could not understand why India did not share their fear and suspicion of Russia's expansionist policy. They thought that with Russian help for the Second Five Year Plan India might be drawn closer to that country.

Russian behaviour in Hungary towards the end of 1956 induced a feeling of revulsion in most educated Indians. But Nehru who had condemned Anglo-French intervention in Suez was silent about Russia's conduct and this was vexing to U.S.A. and Britain. It was just at the time of Russian aggression in Hungary that Russia offered financial assistance to India for the purchase of machinery. This was embarrassing to thoughtful Indians. However, some sections of the public believed that India could look up to Russia for help if China went too far.

In India's confrontation with Pakistan on the question of Bangladesh the only great power that stood steadfast by India was Russia. As A. Appadurai observes the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation between India and the Soviet Union[2] is the important landmark in our relations with Soviet Union (Vide Appendix 6). This Treaty was signed at a time when there was a strong feeling that U.S.A.-Pakistan-China Axis was in the offing. The crucial Article in the Treaty is Article IX which says that "in the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and security of their countries". According to Appadurai the language of the Treaty makes it clear that it is not a defence Treaty but only a form of political co-operation between two neighbouring States, useful to safeguard the security of both. Unfriendly critics of Indira Gandhi's foreign policy fall into two on the recent rejection of the Soviet Union from Egypt and say that it is not wise to strengthen ties with the Soviet Union at a time when its power is on the wane in West Asia.

[2] On 9 August, 1971.

Relations with U.S.A. In the days of the struggle for freedom, India hoped that the U.S.A. would bring moral pressure to bear on U.K. to grant India self-government. During the Second World War a number of U.S. officers came in close contact with Indians. Somehow or other Britishers stood comparatively high in the esteem of the Indians. The destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the use of atom bombs did really shock the Indians. After the withdrawal of Britain from India, Chester Bowles did much to bring the U.S.A. closer to India. But soon Macarthyism undid the good work of Chester Bowles. Towards the end of 1956 when the U.S.A. intervened in the Suez episode and effectively put an end to a probable war, Indian feeling towards the U.S.A. changed for the better, for the reaction was in consonance with India's approach to world affairs. Immediately after this came the announcement of the "Eisenhower Doctrine" with regard to the Middle East. This was made a few days after Nehru's return from his historic visit to the U.S.A. but Nehru had not been told anything about it. That doctrine was complete negation of the policy implied in India's non-alignment. It was clearly a war on communism. India believed in co-existence. American intolerance and hatred of communism was something which India could not clearly understand. India never favoured communism of the Russian or the Chinese type. In spite of obvious differences of the two countries in their approach to world affairs, mutual understanding between India and the U.S.A. grew rapidly. The policy of the U.S.A in helping the under-developed countries greatly impressed the thinking section of the Indian public. Particularly, their monetary and technical help for the development of school education on modern lines endeared the Americans to the people of India.

American expressions of disapproval of India's invasion of Goa were not liked by the Indians. How could peace loving India use force to drive the Portuguese out of Goa? This was the question frequently asked. Both the U.S.A. and U.K. could have brought pressure to bear on Portugal to give away Goa voluntarily as the French had given away Pondicherry, but they did not. Their countenance of Portugal's hold over Goa was

perhaps to test the operation of India's policy of non-violence. Non-violence as a political weapon in international dealings can only have a very limited operation. Non-violence under all conditions is a sheer impossibility in human relationship as things stand at present, unless of course people turn into *Mahatmas.* The cow is no doubt a sacred animal to the Hindu; if, however, a cow threatens to kill a Hindu he is obliged to repel it with force before he can allow himself to be killed, for self-preservation is the prime law of nature. The presence of the Portuguese was inconsistent with the territorial integrity of India. The Western powers might have told India plainly why they desired continuance of Portuguese rule in Goa indefinitely, particulary when Portugal made it clear that nothing but force could dislodge her from Goa and a few other enclaves. India felt that her occupation of Goa by military action was unnecessarily exaggerated into aggression.

Indian expression of opinion on American policy on Cuba was resented by the U.S.A. India has been unable to understand the policy of the U.S.A. in giving a disproportionately large military aid to Pakistan. In spite of the displeasure of the U.S.A. and U.K., India continued to remain non-aligned.

During the Indo-Pakistan war of December 1971, the U.S. government was openly hostile to India. Nixon as the head of the Government had no word of sympathy for the sufferings of Bengali Muslims under the brutal treatment of Pakistan's military regime. Nor did he fully appreciate India's difficulties in giving creature comforts to about ten million refugees that poured into India. It was difficult for Indians to understand Nixon's stand that the matter could have been settled by peaceful means under his direction. Since the beginning of the Seventies there is a definite change in the foreign policy of the USA, the full effect of which on world affairs remains to be seen. It is clear that the USA has accepted co-existence by the manner in which she has wooed China and has entered into talks with Russia on strategic arms limitation. Her withdrawal from Vietnam seems to put an end to cold war policy. Nixon's policy at first seems to have been aimed at isolating India and nipping in the bud what he regrded as the growing political

power of India after her signal victory in her war against Pakistan. However, in his second terms of stewardship of the U.S.A., Nixon is likely to do some rethinking in respect of his policy towards India.

Relation with U.K. One outstanding feature in the relationship between Britain and India is that the statesmen of both the countries were able to conquer the prejudices of the old unhappy days to recognize the community of interest of the two countries. Some big people are puzzled by it. The first thing to be decided after independence was whether India should continue to be a member of the Commonwealth or not. At the Dominion Premiers' Conference in October 1948, Nehru stated that "we may not agree about everything but it is surprising what a large measure of unanimity there was, not only in the objectives to be aimed at, but also in the methods to be pursued....This meeting has shown me that there is great scope for the Commonwealth." Nehru persuaded the Congress to agree to maintain India's connection with the Commonwealth. In spite of opposition Nehru triumphed. The Commonwealth countries showed an imaginative flexibility rarely found in political history by evolving a formula which enabled India to become a Republic and at the same time remain in the Commonwealth, the British Crown remaining no more than a mere symbol. The Constituent Assembly accepted this formula and India is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Before the transfer of power Indian politicians and economists had condemned the link between the rupee and sterling as harmful to Indian interests. In September 1949, Sir Stafford Cripps announced the devaluation of the pound and within a few hours of it, to the surprise of the world, the Indian Cabinet decided on a corresponding devaluation of the rupee so that the close connection of the economy of Britain and India might be kept up. Thus the second issue of relations between rupee and sterling was satisfactorily settled.

The U.K. was unable to understand Nehru's policy of non-alignment. But it was the United Kingdom that first understood that the policy of Nehru was not his own creation, but of the dominant mood of India about the first decade of indepen-

dence. Though non-aligned, India cherishes the same politcal and humanitarian ideals as Britain. We have already referred to several misunderstandings between Britain and India, such as the Congo affair, and Suez question. The introduction of the bill to regulate migration into the U.K. made Indians feel that Britain was getting away from the Commonwealth to Europe. Britain was angry when India did not yield to her pressure not to use force against the Portuguese in Goa. A section of the British Press went beyond reasonable limit to criticize Nehru. About this Percival Griffiths observes :

> On the other hand, there are sections of the British Press which go beyond reasonable limit and seem to delight in sneering at Nehru and his government. They do not present British opinion and their attitude is resented by Englishmen who have lived and worked in India but they receive a lot of attention in Delhi. Circumspection will be particularly necessary in future, in view of recent events.

In spite of differences on certain international issues Britain and India have come closer to each other. The cordial relationship between the two countries was well symbolized by the tumultuous welcome given to Her Majesty the Queen, when she visited india. Her Majesty's presence on 26 January 1961 side by side with the president of India at the Republic Day celebrations well illustrated the breadth and flexibility of the Commonwealth. With the departure of the members of the Civil Service, there have not been in India British students of India's history and culture. The British businessmen who come to India cannot be expected to take any deep interest in oriental studies. The present generation of politicians and officials of India were brought up to English ways of thought. It cannot be said that the rising generation will have such understanding of British culture as their predecessors had. English as an intellectual link between Britain and India is growing weaker and weaker. In order to maintain community of thought and feeling between the two countries it becomes necessary for leaders of both the nations to put forth conscious effort.

India's helplessness when China invaded her in 1962 pulled down the image of Nehru not only in India but also abroad. After the experience of 1962 India strengthened herself militarily to defend herself against foreign aggression. However, Nehru's policy of befriending big Communist countries and small Socialist countries was criticized by his opponents in India. Some felt that a fresh breeze came to the Indian foreign office when Lal Bahadhur Shastri became the Prime Minister. His first priority in foreign policy was India's immediate neighbours like Nepal, Burma, Sri Lanka (Ceylon). He tried his best to get closer to the countries of South East Asia. He also began re-thinking India's policy towards Israel and the Arab Union. It was clear that he had no particular attachment of any kind with the U.S.A., U.K, or U.S.S.R. He was generally regarded as a soft man but showed that he was really a man of iron will in India's war against Pakistan.

We are too near Mrs. Indira Gandhi's government for a proper appraisal of her foreign policy. Compelled by circumstances she has gone much farther than her father Nehru in her love for the Soviet Union. The distance between India and the U.S.A., the continued hostility of China, the bellicosity of Pakistan in spite of her defeat in the 1971 war and the uncertainty of the friendship of South East Asian countries, the unreasonable suspicion of the countries of the Arab Union with regard to the treatment of Muslim minority in India, the impossibility as things stand for regional organizations among Afro-Asian countries for development and self-defence, all seem to be forcing India to draw nearer and nearer to the Soviet Union under Indira Gandhi's administration.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Economic Development

AFTER independence India is on the high road of economic and social advancement. Before the transfer of power the Indian National Congress believed that the poverty of India was the result of British rule and that she would rapidly prosper with independence. Indian economists maintain that in India Britain followed a systematic policy of "planned undevelopment" which left gaps in the country's economy, that would take a long time to fill. Radhakamal Mukherjee observes, "...the distribution of the railway net, the freight rate for railway goods, the marketing organization and the banking system, all helped the British economic regime to replace the products of Indian cottage industries and handicrafts, especially handloom weaving and facilitate the import of British textile goods and export raw material."[1] The cottage industries of India had been deliberately destroyed. The land was impoverished owing to heavy taxation, which left no surplus and no incentive with the tiller to replenish the soil.

[1]Dr. V. B. Singh (Ed), Foreword to *Economic History of India.*

The sizes of agricultural holdings got progressively diminished. The yield from the land steadily declined. In the last four or five decades of British rule there had been some industrial development in India, but it was of a very limited character. In 1947 India's industrial base was thus weak. This only increased the pressure on land and further depressed the already low productivity per worker. The standard of living was poor; opportunities for employment were very limited. All this resulted in accentuating inequalities of income and wealth.

The poverty of India was reflected in the extremely thin social services provided. In the British period public health came to be organized for the British residents employed as heads of various departments in the Government of India. Medical colleges were opened only for the training of a small number of medical men required. Then the Public Health Department was organized and the medical needs of the urban population were catered to. In 1950 there was one physician for every 6,000 people in India. Only nineteen per cent of the population were literates. Poverty, ill-health and illiteracy formed a vicious circle which in its turn sought to perpetuate economic underdevelopment.

Economic Policy. The Congress Government believed that the position could be improved only by discipline and careful organization of the resources and so planning became the cornerstone of the new economic policy of India. Nehru firmly believed that there must be industrial development at all costs. There were two schools of thought as to the right lines of industrial development. Those belonging to the Gandhian school were afraid that India might suffer from the social evils which attended the Industrial Revolution in England and therefore advocated the expansion of cottage industries. The Nehruites recognized that a country without highly developed large-scale industries could not count in the modern world.

The economic policy of free India totally rejected Gandhiji's objection to the growth of cities, but in a way accepted his reform of *Panchayati Raj.* While Gandhiji wanted the village to be an independent unit, Nehru could make it a constituent unit, subordinate to higher organizations, and at the same time

enjoying effective power. Nehru's government believed that in India the percentage of rural population was extraordinarily high and therefore made a deliberate attempt to absorb them in urban industries.

Nehru realized that the immediate establishment of large-scale industries was not an easy matter. It was suggested to him that the sterling balances could be utilized for compulsory purchases of British industries in India. But Nehru said frankly : "We require not only money, but what is far more important, trained human material; in fact that is the only thing in the ultimate analysis, whether it is industry or any other department of life, and let us admit that we have not got a sufficient quantity of that trained human material in any aspect of life today." To raise the standard of living of the people, production must be increased; national wealth and national dividend must be increased. Mere adjustment by a more equal distribution of wealth cannot bring more wealth. So production of more types and kinds of goods was the cardinal principle of Nehru's economic policy.

After the transfer of power various forms of legislative and executive discrimination that had been protecting British commercial interest disappeared. At the beginning of 1948 the Economic Programme Committee of the All India Congress Committee published a resolution envisaging a large measure of state ownership of industry which perturbed commercial circles. Their anxiety was allayed by the Industrial Policy Resolution of 6 April 1948. This resolution recognized India's need for the expansion of production. "For some time to come", the state should concentrate on new units of production instead of undertaking nationalization of existing units. Industries were grouped roughly into three categories. Armaments, railway transport and certain other industries belonging to the first category became a government monopoly. The second category contained a lift of basic and strategic industries such as coal, iron and steel, ship-building and mineral ores and the responsibility for their future development was vested with the state. The third category covered the rest of the industrial field which was open to private enterprise. This policy was reiterated through the

Industrial Policy Resolution of April 1956. This showed clearly that Nehru was deliberately in favour of encouraging private enterprise. However, there were some businessmen who were unhappy about the stipulation of a period of ten years for a final decision on nationalization of industries and were nervous of undertaking long-term investments. They were also disturbed by the statement "that labour's share of profits should be on a sliding scale, normally varying with production" contained in the policy resolution.

The co-existence of public and private sectors in industry is called mixed economy. Government monopoly in certain spheres as in the Post and Telegraph department is inevitable for any government in the modern world. India Government's mixed economy is a via media between the so-called capitalist system and the socialistic pattern of Communist Russia or China. Therefore, the experiment is looked upon with fresh interest by both Western and Eastern Blocs. Democratic India and Communist China started about the same economic level in the early 1950. Both countries have made every effort to increase agricultural as well as industrial production, but the significant difference is that China has used compulsion which India did not.

The industrial policy resolution covered also the investment of foreign capital in India. This part of the resolution was explained by Nehru himself. He made it plain that he wished to encourage foreign capital investment in industry not only for its own sake, but because of the industrial and technical knowledge it would bring with it. He said that as a rule the major interest in a new undertaking should be in Indian hands. The ratio of Indian investment and the foreign investment should be as 51:49 for allowing a foreign concern in India. It was announced that each case would be dealt with on its merits by the government. There was provision for the employment of non-Indians, where necessary, in posts requiring technical skill and experience; the condition imposed was that Indians must be trained for such posts as quickly as possible. Subject to foreign exchange considerations, foreign enterprises would be given facilities to make remittances home. They were promised equal treatment with Indian concerns. The conditions regarding Indian

participation in respect of shareholdings were in practice interpreted with considerable flexibility later. In the period 1948-57 there was a definite shift into manufacture for the home market. The state regulation guided private investment in the manufacturing sector into production for the home market. Up to 1955, however, much of the increased foreign investment in "producer goods production" (for example, petroleum refining, machinery making and automobile manufacture, etc.) was based on imported rather than indigenously produced components and materials. At the same time encouragement for manufacture based on the utilization of indigenous raw material was given.

The manufacture of locomotives at Chittaranjan and sulphate of ammonia at Sindri and the construction of tele-communication equipment in association with a British Company were started as government monopoly. The Government of India in consultation with the Central Advisory Council laid down certain principles for the foreign investor. The first was that a foreign new comer must be concerned primarily with manufacture rather than trade. The then Commerce Minister made it plain that foreign participation in trade was not welcome. The second principle was to allow a foreigner to start a new industrial enterprise, if existing productive capacity in that field had proved to be inadequate, or where the proposed investment would help to save foreign exchange by increasing export or reducing import. The third principle was that training must be given to Indian personnel for senior posts, both administrative and technical. If these principles were satisfied, the government was not rigid with regard to the fifty-one per cent participation by Indian capital.

The question of adequate compensation for property acquired by the Government under the scheme of nationalization came up for discussion. Nehru was prepared to pay some compensation, but he thought it improper to pay full compensation, for it militated against reducing the disparities between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'. The Indian National Congress at Avadi in January 1955 explicitly stated that the object of planning must be the establishment of a socialist pattern of society. In February 1956 at the Amritsar Congress the goal was defined more clearly; the term "socialist pattern" was replaced finally

by "socialism" as the guiding principle. The Imperial Bank of India became a publicly owned and publicly managed State Bank. Life insurance was nationalized. In April 1956 the centre advised the state governments not to grant any licenses for coal prospecting to private parties. Colliery companies were asked to surrender the leases of areas that they had not so far worked. As Nehru noticed that there was prejudice against private sector in the minds of some of his friends and colleagues, he impatiently said: "I want to encourage private enterprise, because I think it desirable to encourage every way that helps a nation's growth and production." In India progress towards the socialistic state has been made not by nationalizing existing industry but by expanding the public sector by controlling private industries and by heavy taxation on accumulation of wealth.

The State Trading Corporation was established in 1955, primarily to handle trade with iron curtain countries. This company was given monopoly in trade in cement. The cost of imported cement was higher than that of cement produced in India. A few years later the import of cement was discontinued and the State Trading Corporation continued to hold the internal trade. It could have reduced the price of cement, but it did not do so, giving room for the accusation that it was being used "as extra-parliamentary source of taxation". Another factor tending towards the socialist state is the control-mindedness of the Government of India. Businessmen feel that they are hemmed in on every side by complicated rules and regulations of the government. For instance, a limited company cannot appoint its managing agents without the approval of the government. Remuneration of directors is also limited by statute. In respect of labour there is a statutory fixation of minimum wages and the award of bonuses. The decisions of the industrial tribunals are binding on the employer and the employee. The criticism levelled is that neither employers nor workers are allowed to learn by experience the value of collective bargain.

Planning no doubt necessitates a certain measure of government controls. But the Government of India seems to regard controls not as temporary measures, but as a part of the permanent

pattern of Indian economic life. In Asian countries economic nationalism has expressed itself generally in three ways. The first is that the industry shall be owned and controlled mainly by *the nationals of the country concerned. The second is that* nationals shall fill superior posts in industry whoever the shareholders may be. The third is the reservation to the country's own citizens of important sections of its trade. Commenting on this trend in economic nationalism Griffith observes: "In all these matters India has been more moderate than some of her neighbours. She has interfered little with the existing non-Indian industry and except to some extent in the matter of taxation, foreign businessmen have not suffered serious discrimination." The Government of India has recognized that it is right for a British-owned firm to have a British head and this necessitates continued recruitment of British assistants who are expected to train Indian personnel to replace them efficiently.

It is impossible in a brief review of this type to enter into details relating to the economic policy of the Government of India towards various departments of Indian industry and commerce. Expansion of public sector with constraints on private enterprise for the gradual development of socialistic pattern of society is the outstanding feature of Indian economic policy. Foreign observers may doubt "if the artificial constraints will benefit the Indian economy in the long run". Conservative leaders may decry controls, permits and licenses, but the Government of India was determined to apply principles of socialism to economic development and at the same time avoid violence and compulsion that have characterized Marxism. In the days of Nehru, the Indian brand of socialism was more in accord with Fabian principles than with Marxism.

Planning for Progress. Poverty has been India's most serious problem. Millions of her people have been living below the margin of subsistence. Since independence four Five Year Plans have been introduced to banish poverty and as we write this India is on the threshold of the Fifth Five Year Plan. Thousands of crores of rupees have been spent towards the banishment of poverty and yet more money is proposed to be spent.

The Congress gave evidence of its faith in planning as far

back as 1937 when it accepted office in the provinces. It soon learnt that without political power it could do nothing. The appointment of the Planning Commission in March 1950 marks the beginning of a new era in the economic history of India. India's Five Year Plans have attracted world-wide attention. America and many Western countries have welcomed them. They regard these plans as a crucial test on behalf of democratic planning, and have pledged their massive support to ensure their success. The first plan (1951-56) was relatively modest and was exceptionally fortunate in that most of its targets were reached. The long-term goal of the plan was to double the national income by 1970-71 and the per capita income by 1977-78. The success that attended the First Five Year Plan led to the revision of objectives in the second plan. It sought to secure the doubling of the national income by 1967-68 and the per capita income by 1973-74. But the 1961 census showed that the planners had underestimated the rate of growth of the population. In the next fifteen years the increase in population is likely to be more than two per cent per annum in spite of attempts to check the growth. Increased population means increased requirements of consumption goods like food and cloth. There should also be a considerable increase in the opportunities for employment. To meet these demands the long-term objective of the Third Five Year Plan was to increase the national income at the rate of six per cent per annum as against the average rate of four per cent during the period of the first two plans.

The goals of the plans are not easy to be attained. The content of each plan goes on increasing and deepening with the pace of development in India and the world. The nature of the goals is such that, like ideals, they cannot be reached. There can only be a progress towards them. In respect of increased production a number of key indices may be taken to indicate the progress made. Our national income at 1960-61 prices increased from Rs. 10,240 crores in 1950-51 to Rs. 14,500 crores in 1960-61. The target for the Third Five Year Plan was Rs. 19,000 crores, which meant doubling the national income. The difficulty here has been the rapid increase in population. Therefore the per capita income does not show a rapid rise.

Considerable emphasis was laid on the development of human resources through increased facilities for education. In all branches of education there has been a phenomenal increase quantitatively. To prevent concentration of economic power and reduce the existing disparities in income and wealth a number of steps have been taken to reorganize the production apparatus both in agriculture and in industry. In agriculture the middle man is eliminated to give tenancy right to the tiller. Greater security of tenure is given to the tiller. Rents are reduced and ceiling on agricultural holdings has been fixed. But before the law relating to it could come into operation estates under joint family had been distributed among the members of the family to avoid any loss. In the sphere of industry, efforts have been made to increase the control of the state representing the collective will of the people. In 1950-51 the state enterprises contributed only two per cent of the production in organized manufacturing industry, but by 1965-66 it is estimated to rise to twenty-five per-cent. Preferential treatment is given to new people entering industry. To reduce concentration of wealth in the hands of a few persons and at a few places, an attempt is made to locate new enterprises in new places. But as yet there is no clear evidence of the benefit of these new enterprises reaching rural artisans and craftsmen. However, attention is being given to the development of rural areas through rural electrification. Various programmes have been launched to develop the weaker sections of the population, so that the existing disparities may be progressively reduced. Taking health facilities to rural areas and schemes of slum clearance in urban areas are of special importance. To improve the lot of the backward classes, there are schemes for the allotment of land, scholarships and other facilities to them. Every effort is made to create employment opportunity. But unfortunately the rapid rise in population, under-employment and unemployment continue to be distressing features. The per capita consumption of food has increased. The expectation of life at birth has increased.

Programmes for development involve considerable financial outlays, both governmental and private. But in hastening the speed of development and seeking to readjust social relationships

considerable stresses and strains are experienced. Therefore, in many directions progress has not been as rapid and in as straight a line as the country's well-wishers would have liked it to be. Whatever may have been the purely economic value of the plan, its psychological impact was tremendous. It engendered a belief in the people that the burden of poverty could be lightened, even if it could not be lifted altogether within a short period. There is no doubt that the country has entered a new dynamic phase. Only an overall picture of certain phases of planning can be given here.

Agriculture. Agriculture still provides fifty per cent of the national income and serves as a means of livelihood for more than seventy per cent of the working population. Agricultural progress since the transfer of power has been spectacular. But still India has not been self-sufficient in food grains. Import of food grains has used up valuable foreign exchange. Agricultural implements are still the same old ones. There are practically no modern tractors, or other machineries except a few on large-scale government farms and reclamation projects. The methods of agriculture too continue to be old-fashioned. Only the richest peasents can buy fertilizers and equipment. Rural indebtedness continues to be heavy. Under the plan the government is providing credit at low rates of interest. Attempts are made to promote the greater use of fertilizers and the formation of marketing cooperatives. The government brought under cultivation much marginal land which the ordinary cultivator had thought it wise to leave alone. The result was that the average yields per acre of the principal crops were considerably lower in 1951 than in 1947. Thereupon the government began to pay more attention to improved methods of cultivation and laid stress on the so-called Japanese system, based on careful seed selection, ruthless destruction of poor plants, greater use of artificial fertilizers in seedling stage and proper spacing between the plants. The government provided facilities for the supply of good seeds and of fertilizers. Demonstration plots were laid out in the villages, and irrigation works were given high priority. In 1955 the production was sixty-six million tons as compared with fifty-two million tons in 1951. Thereafter, there was some flattening in

the curve of progress. The figures in the later fifties, however, showed that the normal out-turn was seventy-five million tons. "Grow More Food Campaign" was intensified. The deficiency of food grains in spite of such attempts is attributable to increase of population and increase in standards of living, as judged by greater consumption of food grains than before. Competent investigations estimated that for the foreseeable future India would need to import two to three million tons of food grains annually. It is a matter of gratification that the U. S. A. undertook to supply seventeen million tons of food grains to India during the Third Five Year Plan period (1956-61). An agricultural production scheme sponsored by the Ford Foundation studied the agricultural problem in India in cooperation with the Indian Government. In April 1959 they reported that the yields could be at least doubled, if the cultivator used better seeds, better tools and better cultivation methods. They also pointed out that the cultivator should be helped with more credit, more fertilizers, better drainage and soil conservation and increased irrigation. They chose fifteen districts of India to demonstrate the possibility of making the land yield more. These are called "package programmes". And if successful they could be repeated in other districts and India could produce food grains enough and to spare. The bottleneck here is to secure the ready and willing cooperation of the peasants. Those who work among them now seem to enjoy little prestige and authority. There is need for outstanding leaders to take up the work of stimulating the peasants to adopt better methods of cultivation.

Closely connected with agricultural development are irrigation and power schemes which formed a main feature of the First and Second Five Year Plan. The power generating capacity of India has been comparatively low. Another fact is that in spite of the great developemt of irrigation during the twentieth century, only about six per cent of the annual flow in the rivers was utilized for irrigation. The planners thought in terms of great storage dams which could be used for the generation of electricity as well as for irrigation. At this time the Tennessee Valley Scheme of the U.S.A. had caught the imagination of the

educated Indians. Therefore, there was a demand for the initiation of multipurpose river schemes. The most important multipurpose schemes which were initiated were the Bhakra-Nangal Project on the Sutlej, the Damodar Valley Scheme and the Hirakud Dam Project. The Bhakra-Nangal Projectutilizes the waters of the Sutlej in the Punjab for irrigation facilities and generating power. The State Government of Punjab and Rajasthan worked it out to completion in 1963. The Bhakra-Nangal Project will also make power available to Delhi and Himachal Pradesh. The Damodar Valley Project was started in 1948 and completed by the end of the Third Plan. Many other similar projects have been worked out, but still village India is in the kerosene lamp stage and only about 2½ per cent of the towns and villages with populations of less than ten thousand have electric supply. At present (November 1972), the country is experiencing an acute shortage of power seriously affecting industries.

Land Reform. Mrs. Kusum Nair in her book on village life observes: "Though since 1947 India has enacted perhaps more land reforms legislation than any other country in the world, it has not succeeded in changing in any essentials the power pattern, the deep economic disparities, nor the traditional hierarchical nature of intergroup relations."

Small size of holdings in land is one of the factors that debar agricultural progress. With the increase in population the average size of the family holding of the land declines. The laws of inheritance in India confer rights on sons, and now on daughters as well, to equal share in the ancestral property, and this has further helped the process of reduction in the size of holdings. Recent enquiries undertaken by the Planning Commission show that a large percentage of holdings is below ten acres. This problem is further aggravated by fragmentation and in the Punjab there are instances of half an acre having been split up into about twenty separate plots. Individual holdings lie scattered over a number of fragments each. No satisfactory solution for the problem of uneconomic holdings has so far been found. The Government of India thinks that cooperative farming can mitigate the evil. But there is resistance from

cultivators. For want of better occupation the owners cling to their small pieces of land. Further, the Indian peasants with their deep traditional love of their own little plots of land refuse to join voluntarily the cooperatives, in spite of the inducement that the government offers by way of credits. In the government scheme, "pooling" is entirely voluntary but withdrawal from the pool would be permitted only under exceptional circumstances. Conservatives like the members of Swatantra Party think that there is very little difference between the India Government's cooperatives and the collectives of the communist type. This has discouraged any vigorous implementation of the cooperative farming policy.

Industries. India's raw material situation is very favourable for industrial development. She has the largest known deposits of high grade iron ore in the world. Her supply of coal is almost limitless; much of it, however, is not fit for coking metallurgical use except through a special process. Rapid progress has been made in respect of utilizing the coal available. India has the world's second largest reserves of bauxite for aluminium as well as ample atomic materials like thorium. She supplies most of free world's manganese essential to the making of steel. She supplies four-fifths of the free world's mica essential for electrical industry and she has also great hydro-electric potential. The only gap in the industrial resources of India has been petroleum. But even here important reserves have been discovered in recent years. Assam and Gujarat contain large reserves. Geological studies show that there may be a number of other important oil-bearing areas.

It is difficult to describe in general terms free India's industrial progress. We may broadly indicate the development under three heads namely, the public sector, the private sector and cottage industries. Official figures show that industrial production in 1959 was twenty per cent greater than in 1955, and if the traditional industries such as cotton textiles, tea and jute were excluded, the increase would work out to fifty per cent. From 1958 onwards the rate of industrial progress has been slowed down a little, partly because of lack of demand in some industries and partly because of foreign exchange difficulties, which

necessitated import restrictions. During the period of the First and Second Five Year Plans industrial production as a whole has increased by forty per cent. But it must be observed that credit for this increase should very largely go to the private sector. The public sector suffered owing to over-optimism in estimating construction times and underestimation of costs. Therefore, a large number of projects in the public sector have fallen behind the time schedule. This does not in any way detract from some remarkable achievements in this sector. The first important achievement in the public sector was the Chittaranjan Locomotive Factory. "This factory is impressive and India is now self-sufficient in steam locomotives, though some component parts of them still have to be imported." The next most important development is the Sindri Fertilizers and Chemicals in Bihar. This was started in 1947 with the collaboration of India, the U.K. and the U.S.A. and completed in 1950. Production started in October 1951. This factory is the biggest of its kind in the East, producing over 300,000 tons of Ammonium Sulphate annually. This is a sure indication that India is fast becoming fertilizer-minded, but even with additional plants of this kind fertilizer production cannot meet the needs of the country for a long time to come.

Other schemes in the public sector followed in quick succession. Machine tools, heavy machine building plant, telephone cables, antibiotics, insecticides and newsprint—all these illustrate the wide range of industries covered in the plan.

Steel production deserves mention. The Rourkela Plant has been working in collaboration with the German firms Krupp and Demag. The Durgapur Steel Plant has been working with the assistance of a consortium of British firms. The Bhilai Steel Plant is put up with technical and financial assistance of the Government of U.S.S.R. There has been a gradual increase in the production of steel.

Outside observers are very critical of the administrative arrangement for the new steel plants. It is said that there has been too much centralization and too little attention to costs. There is again the lack of efficient experienced Indian managers and senior technicians. The Government of India has conti-

nued to employ foreign personnel but find it difficult to secure them in sufficient number. Even the critics admit the wisdom of constructing these three plants which are calculated to save considerable foreign exchange. Difficulties that the steel industry is facing are only of a temporary character and most of them can be surmounted. There is every hope that before long India can attain the foremost position among the great producers of steel. The possibilities of development of North East India as a steel producing centre are so great that someone recently remarked: "Here an Indian Ruhr is in its making."

The development of the oil industries has been hampered by insistence of government for a long time that the expansion of refining and distribution of oil should be confined to the public sector. In 1959 a new company called Oil India Ltd. was founded. In this the Government of India holds one-third of the equity capital and the Burma Oil Company two-third. The aim of this company is to develop the new field, and to build the pipe line for conveying the oil to two new refineries constructed by the Government of India, with assistance from Russia and Rumania. India's requirements of oil at the beginning of Second Five Year Plan amounted to seven million tons. Only four hundred thousand were available from local production. The Nahorkatiya field in Assam is expected to produce two and half million to five million tons annually, so that half of India's needs will be met from the local production. The new refineries will increase India's capacity by about fifty per cent to a figure of 8¾ million tons in terms of crude petroleum, which is roughly equal to India's present need.

Machine building requires mention. To manufacture the much needed heavy electrical equipment and machinery the government has set up a factory (Heavy Electricals Ltd.) at Bhopal. The government entered into an agreement with a Swiss firm to set up a machine tool factory called Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd. at Jalahalli, Bangalore, to make the country self-sufficient.

Although the taxation is high, the private sector is abounding in vitality. Partly under the influence of protection and partly as a result of collaboration between the British and

foreign industrialists there has been a great expansion in the private sector. Those who were formerly only traders and financiers have shown a readiness and willingness to enter the industrial field. It is impossible to detail the great diversification in industry during the plan period. But we may say that the development has been well balanced. Industries of particular importance in India's development are those concerned with engineering, heavy chemicals, metallurgy and cement. In all these fields there has been a remarkable expansion. Nevertheless, substantial import is still necessary, pointing to the need for further expansion. The demand for cement is almost unlimited, and the satisfactory progress which has been made in this industry is of great importance to the whole economy.

The availability of steel has stimulated the development of small industries. Many small industrial enterprises, completely in private hands, have sprung up to produce such articles as bicycle parts, cardboard boxes, matches, shoes, carpets, umbrella ribs, aluminium utensils, etc. The government has been actively helping these small-scale industries, by giving them electric power, floor space in factories and other facilities at nominal cost in over a hundred locations called "industrial estates".

In respect of cotton textiles the government policy is to see that the mill industry does not hamper the handloom industry. So the government placed restrictions on any increase in the number of looms in cotton mills. Production of mill-made *dhoties* was also limited. In spite of these restrictions, total production of cotton cloth has appreciably increased. But when export market contracted production necessarily declined.

Sugar production has been a heavily protected one. At present the sugar production may be said to be equal to India's total demand. But the consumption of sugar is showing a rise in recent years, which is an indication of the general rise in the standard of living. The unsatisfactory features of this industry are the low yields of cane per acre (less than one quarter of that in Japan) and low extraction rate.

India is passing through a period of transition, when neither agriculture nor large-scale industry is able to provide anything

like full employment. In the early days of independence, there were some who on sentimental grounds opposed the development of large-scale industries for fear they would hamper the development of cottage industries. Scientific enquiries of such bodies as the Ford Foundation have led the government to feel that the policy of developing large-scale industries is sound. But still there are people who are inclined to the view that the new industries should not be allowed to compete with cottage industries. It is a fact that cottage industries employ about twenty million people. Nearly a quarter of these people are engaged in the handloom industry. The government has therefore made arrangements to assist the development of small-scale industries. Their policy is to arrange production programmes, to teach improved techniques, and to make capital grants for the provision of modern equipment. Both the central government and state governments offer financial and technical assitances. The National Small Industries Corporation has been formed to secure assistance to village industries. This corporation grants credits to small units, and helps them to get machinery and equipment on hire purchase. Village industries are likely to be transformed with increased use of electric power. The attempt is to develop these small-scale units as ancillaries to large-scale industries. But it must be observed that there has been no appreciable progress in this direction. The necessity for the development of these small-scale industries and village crafts must be conceded in the present transition period of the Indian economy.

The objectives of the Third Five Year Plan (1961-66) could not be realized to the extent expected because of the war against China in 1962 and Pakistan in 1965. The agriculture sector did not work properly, so that it was necessary to import foodgrains. Owing to paucity of internal resources and failure to get foreign aid, the Fourth Plan was postponed to 1 April 1969. This plan has not satisfactorily worked for political and economic reasons. To accelerate progress in the Fifth Five Year Plan period Indira Gandhi's government has taken several important steps to mitigate and reduce the concentration of economic power. Important among the measures taken are

special programmes for the benefit of the weak and the under-privileged; abolition of the managing agency system; control of monopoly and nationalization of banks. The stress in the Fifth Plan is on employment and social justice.

Objectives of Plan can be realized only with adequate financial outlay. The Public Sector enterprises should as a rule not be allowed to expand until they yield surpluses which finance such expenses at least in part. At present there are regional imbalances in the location and development of industries which require correction. This is not merely a question of social justice. It has reference to the maintenance of political stability without which no economic progress can be achieved in any part of the country.

Community Development. There is a growing awareness that without improving the position of her villages, India cannot make any progress. The state, through the community development programme, has been doing its best to put the people on the path of self-help. It was quite fitting that the programme was launched on Gandhiji's birthday, 2 October 1952. The aim of this programme is that each village should have a plan of all-round development; of increasing agricultural production, organizing village crafts, giving health education and providing minimum health services, providing educational facilities for children and adults, providing recreational facilities, improving housing and family living conditions and providing programmes for women, children, youth and other similar groups. Each family should also have a plan for its own development. There is evidence to show that tangible benefits have accrued to the rural population in those villages, where there has been hearty cooperation between the villagers and the departmental officials, in working out the community development project. According to Dr. D.R. Gadgil, an eminent economist, the community development scheme has not borne the desired results, because "characteristically, it originated with a foreign expert, and was sponsored and worked through top-level bureaucrats". An official investigating body admits that the community development has failed to "evoke popular initiative". Concerted measures to improve the situation have not so far been successful. It

is clear that there is much to be done to make it a people's programme from being an official programme. And as V.P. Nayar observes, "the success of this transformation will determine the degree to which democracy succeeds in India and the fruits of economic development reach the poorest of the poor." The economic regeneration of India very largely depends on the speed and efficiency with which science and technology are adapted to the creation of tempting opportunities for enterprising village artisans who are at present unorganized and isolated in their traditional setting.

Unemployment. Large-scale and small-scale industries, both public and private, have been started in large numbers. But still the unemployment problem has assumed distressing dimensions. In 1951 there were three million people unemployed in India, in 1961 the number of unemployed rose three times, i.e. nine million. This may not be large in consideration of the total rise of population to 439 million. We are told that in U.S. with a population of 180 million it is not unusual for four or five million to be unemployed. But the problem in India is accentuated by the fact that an additional fifteen to eighteen million people are "under-employed". In other countries it is usual to include those who do not find high enough wages to support themselves, among the unemployed. A peculiarly tragic situation in India is that those who have had high school and sometimes even college education are not able to find jobs. This problem of "educated unemployed" still remains to be satisfactorily tackled.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Social Progress

THE social progress of a nation is to some extent a by-product of economic development. However, certain aspects of it require special treatment. The people of India have after independence shown an awareness of their own backwardness and a consciousness of their own needs. India's vast population is at once a strength and weakness. Recognizing this the Government of India have been trying to maximize the contribution of every citizen through the national effort at development. Considerable emphasis is laid on the development of human resources through increased facilities for education, health and social welfare.

The Third Five Year Plan says:

> ...in all directions, the pace of development will depend largely upon the quality of public administration, the efficiency with which it works, and the cooperation which it evokes. The tasks facing the administration are larger in magnitude and more complex, but also richer in meaning than in earlier days. From the maintenance of law and

order and the collection of revenue, the major emphasis now shifts to the development of human and material resources and the elimination of poverty and want.

We may say that the Government of India is determined to reach the plan targets with the aid of a competent and honest staff. To set up a body of officials who are competent, honest and efficient in the discharge of their duties is exclusively an Indian task. For in this there can be no foreign participation.

We have to repeat that a radical change is necessary in the system of education to suit the conditions in our developing country. Griffith observes: "Despite the efforts of individual officers the British had been less successful in the sphere of education than in any other department. A self-governing India thus has a great task ahead of her in this field." The Report of the Indian Education Commission has given the desirable new direction to education at different levels.

In the Second Five Year Plan a good deal of attention had been given to what is called social education. To cure the illiteracy of three quarters of adult population, the Congress Party realized that it was not possible to wait and let juvenile education play its part in course of time. So the Party started a vigorous campaign of adult education, but soon found that the results were disappointing, for the adults quickly relapsed into illiteracy. The Planning Commission, therefore, widened the concept of adult education and included citizenship training and enlightened use of leisure in the course designed. In each district at least one primary school was turned into a community centre, but the experiment has for long remained in the pioneering stage. A Central Welfare Board was constituted. Its three primary functions were provision of financial and technical assistance to voluntary organizations engaged in the welfare of women, children (normal and handicapped) and delinquents, initiation of projects to enable women and others to supplement their income and training welfare personnel (*gramasevikas*) for the spread of modern ideas of hygiene and child welfare among villagers. The most important work of these village workers in the words of V.T. Krishnamachari is "to change the outlook

of the sixty million families living in the countryside, arouse enthusiasm in them for new knowledge and new ways of life and fill them with the ambition and the will to live a better life". Experience shows that attempt at social education have not so far given very satisfactory results.

The Planning Commission has put much emphasis on measures for the improvement of medical and health services. Subject to the limiting factor of finance, much good work has been done in this field after the transfer of power, largely because firm foundations had been laid in this than in the field of education by the British Government. In the decade of the first two plans hospital beds rose from 113,000 to 186,000 and doctors from 56,000 to 70,000 but yet we have only one doctor for every 6,000 people, nor are beds sufficient to medical needs.

The consumption of food and clothing per capita is disgracefully low. Housing is an important tool for measuring the economic well-being of a people. The increase in population has greatly aggravated the problem of housing. In villages houses continue to be ill-built and overcrowded. No regard for sanitation, ventilation or comfort has yet been paid in most villages. Slum clearance in cities has not been as effective as expected. Pavement dwellers have increased in number in large cities. Land values in the cities have shot up to unimaginable heights. The Government asserts its faith in the work of cooperative house building societies. Town planning laws have to be suitably modified if cooperative housing activities should produce better results. Housing is an age-old problem and it is impossible to solve it in the course of ten or fifteen years. The point to be noted is that increase in the pupulation has greatly neutralized the gains made under the successive Five Year Plans.

To check the growth of population, the message of family planning is carried to the countryside. The family planning scheme cannot produce the intended results without a regular supply of the necessary appliances to people desirous of limiting the size of the family. The 1961 report of the census of India points out "although our mortality is low by former standards, our morbidity is nevertheless distressingly high". Unregulated

additions to the population will only add to the already existing morbidity. More children means feeding more persons who cannot contribute to production. It then becomes impossible to increase the wealth of a nation. In the present circumstances the purchasing power can only remain stagnant or go down. In his inaugural address to the Second Indian Conference on Research in National Income (31 August 1950) the then Governor of Reserve Bank of India, H.V.R. Iyengar said:

> It is conceivable that, while the per capita income is going up, the standard of living of large sectors of the population might be stationary or might even be going down. In fact, one of the criticisms sometimes made of our economic programme is precisely this, that the figures showing a rise in per capita income disguise the fact of economic stagnation for the bulk of our rural population.

Although there is no active opposition to family planning, most people have chosen to be indifferent to it.

Ever since 1947 India has been seeking to effect radical changes in the laws related to marriage, succession and women's right to property so that the country may be brought on a level with modern societies in Western countries. It was Mahatma Gandhi's view that laws promulgated should be such as people would readily and willingly obey. The effect of laws calculated to bring about social reforms has still to be evaluated. One thing is certain . The village societies are now being shaken up. The policy of decentralization and the institution of *Panchayati Raj* entrusted with some political and economic initiative would, it is hoped, weld together the different social groups in villages and create a new social order. The old status-dominated society is in the process of being transformed into an egalitarian democratic community. To what extent the belief that handicrafts are broadly caste occupations and that any financial support given to them would only perpetuate the caste system is responsible for the niggardly treatment given to cottage industries deserves examination. It is well to bear in mind that progress can be achieved only when there is an effec-

tive compromise between traditional caste organization and the socialism of the Government of India. We may say that in India, at present, there are no convinced advocates of caste. There is none upholding untouchability. Special opportunities for pulling up the backward classes are welcomed. But the special privileges and concessions afforded to backward classes are such that there is a tendency among them to continue to call themselves backward, for nothing more than receiving the benefits. Of course, poverty is at the root of this psychology in them.

The Scheduled Class Tribes, the oldest inhabitants of India, have survived in their own way, in spite of the callousness of governments and the acquisitiveness of European planters who deprived them of their food and freedom. On the inaccessible hills, tribal solidarity has preserved the corporate sense which is very valuable to Indian society. Social progress demands that the tribes should be enabled to become equal sharers and collaborators with the rest in the social and political life of the country.

The state has assumed the role of moral preacher by the enactment of laws relating to prohibition, use of gold and the elimination of brothels. These are matters in which effective public opinion more than laws can produce desirable results. So far as prohibition is concerned it is admittedly a failure. It must be owned that efforts of social reformers and legislative measures for ushering in conditions favourable for the development of socialism are meeting with silent and unseen resistance of age-long custom. It will indeed take a very long time for inter-caste marriages to be common in India. The development of trade union movement may be cited as instance for the growth of socialism. But the Government of India as already observed has left very little initiative to labour organizations to get practice in collective bargaining.

It is realized that the public sector and the private sector should work in unison for realizing the ideals of socialist economy. But the public ownership of industries is ordinarily charged with "lack of imagination, rigidity, disregard of human considerations dilatoriness and, of course, wastefulness and lack

of what is called cost consciousness". The private sector, though it has shown greater efficiency than the public sector, has also its own difficulties and drawbacks in respect of size, heirarchy of command, control and chronic conflict between labour and management. More than all it has no obligation to render an account for the manner in which it exercises its powers and privileges. Confirmed socialists are urging a reappraisal of the whole position including the industrial policy of the government. They call for measures which will prevent socialism being used as "a cover for the pursuit of acquisitive private interest". The attempts of plans to reduce the disparities between the high income and low income groups preventing concentration of economic power and working for the welfare of all should be assessed in the context of the situation obtaining both in the public and private sectors.

The most significant feature of Indian social life after Independence arises out of a combination of the idea of secular state and the principles of socialist economy. Side by side with the secular promise there can be seen a strengthening of religious faith among all classes of people. For example, the first *Kumbh mela* after Independence, a festival that occurs once in twelve years, attracted more than five million pilgrims to Allahabad. Every year there has been a growing number of pilgrims to places like Badarinath, Gaya, Tirupati and Rameswaram. The religious feeling that is evidenced is neither dogmatic nor sectarian, but moved by deep faith. In the post-Independence period the life and activities of such saints as Ramana Maharshi, Aurobindo, Anandamoyee Devi and Sivananda have attracted wider attention than ever before. There is a persistent desire on the part of the Hindus to rebuild the temples destroyed by the Muslims. Many castes which had been considered low in rank have definitely come up in the social scale, although caste continues to throw its shadow on the social scene. The superiority of the Brahmanās is not accepted by anyone today. Other communities have displaced the Kshathriyas and the Vaisyas. Social progress has meant allowing power to get into the hands of the working class.

The prevalence of casteism in politics cannot easily be dism-

issed as Panikkar does by saying: "This accusation comes mainly from the higher castes whose privileged position in society, official life and politics, is being threatened by the awakening of the new classes." The Vanniyakula Kshatriyas of Madras feel that they have not had their share of political power compared to the Mudaliars and Nadars. In Rajasthan the ascendancy of the Jat caste has been causing concern to the Rajputs. In the Andhra the Reddies and Kammas are vying with one another for capturing political power. In Karnatak the Lingayat and the Okkaligas form rival groups. There are still some who observe that the Brahmanās in the South and Kayasthas in the North continue to be holding influential positions. In U.P. there is a special problem of the Muslims who are dispossessed of their *jagirs.* Although the Muslims form a minority, still their total strength is forty million scattered over different parts of India. They are naturally affected by the form of Hindu revivalism. To bring about a healthy social relationship among the communities belonging to a plural society is by no means an easy matter.

With the abolition of *zamins* and *jagirs* and the integration of states, feudalism based on princely privilege and hereditary landownership disappeared altogether. But the hierarchical character of Indian society only underwent a change. The Maharajas, Nawabs and other titled nobilities could no longer claim social leadership, and remained in their palaces and bungalows, hiding their diminished heads. The new millionaires, the so-called industrial magnates, with vast patronage at their disposal stepped into the place vacated by the nobilities. This seemed to be a real danger, for it was easy for them to acquire political power as an adjunct to their financial empire. The control of the newspaper press in particular passed into the hands of industrial magnates. Some of them even sought to build up political connections with party leaders. The government were not slow to check this development by their system of taxation. They levied a crippling super tax at higher levels of income. An expenditure tax, a wealth tax, succession duties, gift tax—all these together with a stricter administration of Company Laws prevented the concentration of wealth in a few

hands to a great extent.

Addressing a meeting of industrialists, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said: "What the level of taxation should be at any given time, calls for a deep study of the prevailing situation as well as of the direction in which the economy should be moving at that point of time. A sectional or static view can be dangerous. It we think in terms of today, we might seem to be better off if taxes were reduced. But the results tomorrow may be different. There would either be large-scale unemployment following cuts in Government expenditure, or a further upsurge of prices due to inflation. So taxation should not be discussed as an issue between the Government which levies them and business and industry and the consumers who pay, but in terms of its impact on the country—whether it acts as an accelerator or as a brake."[1]

The joint family ownership of land has gone but this has now been replaced by a similar ownership of industrial concerns in spite of the severity of the Acts, rules and regulations.

Let us now turn to the position of women after independence. On the position and influence of women in Indian society in the past much nonsense has been written by ill-informed European writers who have been astonished at their progress in recent years and attribute it altogether to the influence of the West or of Christianity. Indians, accustomed as they have been to take a balanced view, are not surprised at the rapid change that has come over the position of women after independence. During the non-cooperation movement, women vied with men in exhibiting their spirit of self-sacrifice. The Constitution of India gave women equal political rights with men and opened up avenues of employment. The Hindu Code superseded the traditional personal laws of Hindus. This has the potentiality of bringing about a revolutionary change in the position of women. According to it, marriage was made a civil contract, polygamy was abolished and divorce was permitted under certain well-defined conditions. Caste restrictions in respect of marriage were done away with. A uniform law was enacted for all Hindus. The

[1] D.N. Kalhan, *Indira Gandhi : Three Years as Prime Minister*, p. 56.

riages are still, even in the case of educated family, arranged by parents, and governed by traditional caste restrictions. However, in higher circles of society intercaste marriages are not frowned upon by society or disowned by relatives. Quantitatively there has been relatively more progress in the higher education of women than in the earlier period. The Act relating to dowries is observed more in its breach than in its observance. Therefore, to pay for the education of girls besides providing for their marriages and dowry on a conventional scale presents at present a hard economic problem for the parents.

Today women are functioning as ministers, deputy-ministers, secretaries, and under-secretaries in the goverment. A few exceptionally brilliant women compete for the foreign service. The majority of educated women limit themselves to the professions of teaching and medicine. There are a few who choose law. Increasing numbers of women seek employment in business firms as secretaries and clerks. Politics attract a few women. The Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi, is a woman who has won the love and admiration of the educated women all over the world. It is interesting to note what she says on her being a woman:

> Although I am in no sense a feminist, I happen to believe in the possibility of women being able to do everything. If a woman has qualifications and ability for any profession, she should be in it. A woman's work is more difficult than a man's because she has to look after the work as well as her home. I do not believe that a person who neglects the home can do other things well.[2]

It is women in industry that are generally uneducated, and

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

very soon these women too will have the benefit of education. The arts of music and dancing engage women's attention as ever. The social reformers in the second half of nineteenth century considered dancing to be a degenerate and immoral art. At the beginning of the twentieth century that opinion began to change. The cinema industry has drawn educated women from some good families. There is a revival of Indian classical dancing. In spite of all these changes in the status of women, it must be observed, that most Indian women remain conservative in their approach to life. They quietly accept traditional ways of life, resisting the impact of changing ideas.

In the fields of art and literature there has been a great deal of progress, but it is not possible to give any satisfactory review of them here. Broadly stated, in the literature of different Indian languages secularity, copiousness, variety and vitality have characterized the writings and contact has been established through English language not only with the literature of England but with that of European countries. The forms of novel, drama, short story and essay have been adopted everywhere in India and new experiments tried in the creation of verse forms. The Government of India has brought into being several academies to promote art, literature and science. Titles and national awards are given every year to persons who have distinguished themselves in art or literature or by their social services to the country. Musicians, literary men and teachers are given national awards for distinguished service in their respective fields.

The policy of the Government of India is to bring about a total improvement in the life of individuals through their plans. Much that formerly belonged to the sphere of the family has now been taken over by the government. In every department of activity Jawaharlal Nehru in his period of seventeen years of prime ministership gave the imprint of his personality. The death of Jawaharlal Nehru on 27 May 1964 marks the end of an era in India. It is impossible to estimate the loss that India sustained by the death of Nehru who was really a much bigger man than a national leader. His one desire was to make India dynamic and to give a new meaning and purpose to the sapless life he saw around him. No creed or dogma could claim his

allegiance if it offended against the dignity of man. As Kulkarni says: "Nehru's was indeed a world presence, and mankind is the poorer without him."

Succeeding Lal Bahadhur Shastri as Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi has been trying to follow the footsteps of her illustrious father. The presence of elderly statesmen in her Cabinet and in the Counsels of the Congress was not to her advantage in the pursuit of her socialistic ideas and in her desire to associate younger men in the administration of the country. She fell out with them and became the leader of the New Congress.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

National Integration

Cultural Renaissance. The cultural renaissance which forms the background of socio-economic improvement through the Five Year Plans should be clearly understood for a proper perspective of the history of India in the post-independence period. Here we can only briefly touch upon some important trends in India's cultural renaissance. The mass movement started by Gandhiji was no doubt greatly responsible for hastening the attainment of political independence. But that the movement was led by the elite of the nation should always be kept in mind. Till the end of eighteenth century the Indian elite consisted of a few of the princes, nobles, merchants and top castes and was entirely mediaeval in character. In the nineteenth century owing to the impact of modern education it passed through several metamorphoses. At first it was strongly Westernized; then it attempted a synthesis between Indian and Western cultures. Here again the impact of the West was a predominant feature. The third phase of development marks a period of national upsurge, when there was a concerted attempt to exclude

Western influence. In this phase, the influences of democratic liberalism were powerfully checked. Great writers sprang up in different parts of the country. A sprit of nationalism pervaded almost every section of the community. The battle for freedom was fought by the elite which then more than ever before was closest to the masses. We may call this a creative period. But unfortunately after independence there was a waning of the sprit, and the directing classes showed adherenee to contrary values. A very large section of the population somehow or other began to lose their grip on the national heritage, and a small minority became militantly revivalist. The distance between the elite and the masses, far from being reduced, became widened and the support that Nehru gave to what is called 'Kamaraj Plan' (that of ministers at centre and in states resigning voluntarily to contact the masses and strengthen the Congress) has to be understood in this context. It is better to avoid an appraisal of the plan at present, because it is still bound up with personality clashes and power politics. The intelligentsia as constituted at present has to be changed "in quality, composition, in academic heights and in creativity". Happily it is no longer restricted to a few of the privileged classes: it includes persons belonging to all castes and different strata of society. But the educational system has not yet sufficiently improved to identify talent in all areas and help to promote its growth. It may reasonably be expected that the Indian elite, at least the best among them, should be comparable to their compeers in any other progressive country. Frankly, we believe that there is much to be done to increase the number of intellectuals in our country. We wonder why after the period of struggle for independence the creative era of the Indian intellectual should have receded. Unless the educational system tackles seriously the most difficult task of ensuring quality and creativity, cultural renaissance cannot pay good dividends. We are at present largely dependent on external sources not only for financial and military help, but also for scientific knowledge and technical know-how. One of the unforseen tendencies of the Indian democracy is that a considerable number of those whom we would call non-elite have got into positions of power. This need not be grudged to them, but it is

regrettable to note that they do not seem to have accepted the need for anything like intellectual guidance. There is no doubt that somehow a break-through will come. The days when the country could rely on a few great men are gone, and with Browning we pray: "Make no more giants God! Raise up the whole race at once."

During the period of struggle for independence the educated community was suspected of aiding the Britisher in the exploitation of the masses. The masses were later to a great extent satisfied that the elite finally revolted against the British authority and won freedom for the country. And after the attainment of independence the educated section appears to have fallen into disfavour with the masses, so that the task of establishing a proper relationship between the elite and the masses has become urgent. One other feature of the cultural renaissance should be noted. It has drawn more from Western literature and democratic liberalism than from modern science and technology, and India can resuscitate herself only when a modern society with a predominantly scientific outlook is ushered into existence. Science and philosophy are not antithetical. There is indeed more culture in agriculture than that which ordinarily meets the eye.

As J.P. Naik, a great educationist, observes:

> ...What we need is an educational system which will not only preserve our cultural heritage but also continually modify it by a judicious process of commissions, additions and modifications to suit new situations and challenges. This is not difficult for Hindus because, as Dr. Radhakrishnan has pointed out, Hinduism is not a *position*, but a *movement*. Muslims have stronger resistances on this point, But they too cannot but cultivate the humility to seek truth from outside. The conceptualization of this new form of cultural renaissance and to carry these new concepts to the masses is the responsibility of the educational system. [1]

National Integration. National integration is one of the most

[1] *Educational Planning in India*, p. 101, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

important of India's national goals. This is sometimes called emotional integration. But "integration" in the national or emotional context does not admit of any satisfactory explanation. Love and hatred are emotional expressions which can never be integrated. Hindus and Muslims have lived over 700 years together. Yet there has been no social integration. The idea behind national integration is to bring about unity which makes the plural society in India a nation. The fundamental requisite is the recognition of unity in diversity. This is necessary for national development as well as for defence against foreign aggression. Economic equality and equitable distribution of wealth and power are basic in a democratic structure.

Boundary disputes due to regionalism, anti-Hindi agitation from narrow lingualism and more than all Hindu-Muslim riots so disturbed the mind of Nehru that he was bent upon evolving a plan to put an end to fissiparous tendencies. A conference of the Chief Ministers of the States and leaders of all non-communal parties met under the chairmanship of Jawaharlal Nehru. This conference discussed the problem of divisive forces at length and finally resolved upon a programme of action to bring about greater national integration. We have already said that anything like social integration among the religious communities in India and more particulary between the Hindus and Muslims is an impossibility. All that can be expected is to promote a high sense of loyalty to India, a loyalty that would sacrifice narrow commual interests for the good of the country as a whole. Except a few communists who have extra-territorial loyalty, all others do have a sense of loyalty to India. There may however be a small section of Muslims who may feel drawn towards Pakistan and therefore have a sense of divided loyalty. Since independence the University of Aligarh has been gradually advancing towards secularism. Even that section of Tamil people which demanded a separate independent state gave it up and demonstrated their Indianness during the time of Chinese aggression.

There is no problem in India of breaking external ties as in the case of the United States. The United States have developed into a multi-ethnical state in a remarkably short time. The

Americans are one, so far as their relation with other countries is concerned. But it cannot be said that the United States is altogether free from regional and group tensions. The problem of the Negroes in the Southern States is still giving trouble. In the Second World War the Japanese-Americans were evacuated to less sensitive areas as it was feared that they might be disloyal. Much has been done to keep the Jews loyal to the U.S.A. by extending political liberties and giving opportunities for economic prosperity. In spite of it all the Jewish allegiance to a world-wide community remains strong as ever. Race riots are by no means uncommon in the U.S.A. There is resistance to liberal racial policies of the federal government. Racial segregation is common. The Americans are not altogether free from anti-semitic feelings or contempt for Red Indians. All these show that the national and emotional integration even in the U.S.A. is not quite complete. India's troubles arise out of the pluralistic nature of her society. It would take some time for the Muslims to reconcile themselves that they are a minority community who have to adjust themselves to the Hindus who form a majority. They realize that India is a secular state and that they have equal political rights with the Hindus. All that they have got to do is to discard the sense of superiority arising out of a feeling that they had once been the rulers of the land. The Muslim society has been exclusive and will continue to be so for a long time. The orthodox Hindu in spite of his religious tolerance has an innate revulsion for the non-Hindu which cannot easily be detected. The Hindu-Muslim relationship is therefore one major problem of national integration. The Muslims who have stayed behind in the Gangetic valley find it difficult to forget the past and to reconcile themselves to the concept of a secular India. The Hindus, particularly of the Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, find it difficult to accept the view that the Muslims there are not emotionally committed to Pakistan. But as time passes we may be sure that a general tolerance of each other's ideals will prevail, and the loyalty of Muslims to India will grow stronger and stronger. History shows that Islam and Hinduism have influenced each other in marginal ways such as the formation of certain religious sects and Indo-Islamic art and archi-

tecture. So national integration in respect of Muslims only means friendly collaboration with the rest of the community and loyalty to India. An exclusive society like that of the Muslims cannot merge its identity with the wider Indian community.

As for regionalism there is no democratic country in the world that is absolutely free from it. Indian regionalism cannot stand in the way of India's integration. The Swiss confederation is made up of small states based on the acceptance of the value of regional feeling. In federations like Germany and Soviet Union, regionalism is a well-marked and accepted characteristic so long as the primacy of the national interest is recognized. If there is no dominance of one area over another in India there is no fear of regionalism developing into dangerous proportions. India is a multi-lingual country. A democracy, particularly of the federal form, must encourage the growth of regional languages not only to safeguard local interests but also to prevent dissatisfaction from taking root. The dangers of regionalism in India arise from the fact that there are certain areas and groups which at present enjoy more than their share of power, and opportunities for industrial development. But a wise policy of the federal government can surely allay fears in this regard. The creation of linguistic provinces is regarded as a mistake by some, but it is difficult to see how the language problem can seriously interfere with national unity. However, enthusiasm for one's regional lauguage should not stand in the way of the development of other sister languages. Very much depends on the caution, circumspection and adjustability that the Hindi-speaking areas bring to bear on the language problem, for they are at present impatient to make Hindi the official language of India to the exclusion of English. Educationists complain that national integration has so far remained only as an abstract concept and that no work has been done at the level of educational technology to concretize the idea.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Prospect

IT will be seen from the foregoing pages that India is the scene of a great experiment in democracy. After 1947 there has been a remarkable change in the attitude of the Indian people towards life and its problems. Western writers who had been sceptical about India's capacity to change were struck with wonder at the rapid strides she took in the decade following independence. The question often asked is: "Can the enthusiasm generated be sustained and the democracy be of enduring value?" Several writers, both Indian and foreign, have attempted to estimate India's progress after independence. All agree that India is well set for carrying on successfully the experiment in democracy. There are, however, a few who fear that a possible revival of the traditions of a caste-bound society might adversely affect the growth of a parliamentary system of responsible government. Indian ideas of freedom, equality and government by consent with the participation of all sections of the community are not all borrowings but are partly based, in some form or other, on traditions of ancient Indian Republic and the

Panchayati Raj that had been extensively in vogue from very early times to the day of the withdrawal of Britain from India. Further, the people had considerable training in shouldering civic and legislative responsibilities during the later half of the British period.

To make a proper appraisal of the Indian socio-political experiment one must be thoroughly acquainted with the philosophy of history with reference to the belief in a law of progress and its value as a factor in human development. We do not here propose to burden the reader with any discussion on this topic. Suffice it to say that the people of India believe that their country will progress rapidly towards social and economic uplift. India has decided on the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society. At present, it is not possible to give a complete picture of what exactly this goal envisages. But the idea of a socialistic pattern of society, however nebulous, has proved itself valuable as a kind of tonic to keep up the courage and vitality of the govenment and the people, in their socio-economic effort. In estimating the progress of India each writer is guided by his own point of view of progress. Those with leanings towards Western democracies study the possibilities of democracy taking root in India, so as to stem the tide of advancing communism. Those with communist leanings fondly hope that the advocacy of state ownership in cetain spheres of industry might in time develop into a kind of socialism which may not be far different from communism. India by following her policy of non-alignment has afforded scope for the two rival blocs opportunities for improvement of their relations with her in trade and commerce and for exchange of cultural missions. Probably, there is no country in the world that has so clearly seen the danger in man's power over nature as India, guided by a long line of sages and philosophers, the latest of whom is Mahatma Gandhi. India realizes that the growth of man's control over nature should be accompanied by a parallel growth of control over himself. Western thinkers admit that this recognition is the only way of reducing the evils of rank materialism. At the moment, however, India's pre-occupation is with improvement in the standard of living and the reduction of

the abnormal disparity between the few rich and the innumerable poor. In her attempt to secure a reasonable share of good things of this world for her poverty-stricken people, India has constantly kept before her the spirit of the words with which S. Radhakrishnan, formerly the President of India, concludes his essay on Hinduism:

> In my travels round the country and abroad I have learnt that there are thousands of men and women to-day who are hungry to hear the good news of the birth of a new order, eager to do and dare, ready to make sacrifices that a new society may be born, men and women who dimly understand that the principles of a true religion, of a just social order, of a great movement of generosity in human relations, domestic and industrial, economic and political, national and international, are to be found in the basic principles of the Hindu religion. Their presence in growing numbers is the pledge for the victory of the powers of light, and love over those of darkness, death and discord.

We may add that the basic principles of other religions such as Islam and Christianity are quite in consonance with Hinduism in this respect, although the votaries of each religion may wrangle over some non-essential differences in religious practices. India is out, not only to improve her agriculture by the use of machinery and chemical fertilizers but also to industrialize the country avoiding the protracted misery to which the workers had been submitted in the period of Industrial Revolution in Western Europe.

Afro-Asian nations that have won their independence are legitimately proud of their achievement. However, their pride is humbled at the thought that the value of independence is considerably lessened by the necessity of their having to depend on advanced countries of the West, for military equipment to safeguard their frontiers and for financial help for educational, agricultural and industrial development. More than all, they have still to learn from Western countries scientific knowledge and technical know-how.

Keith Callard writing about Pakistan mentions the conditions under which democracy develops :

> Democracy has usually developed in countries where there is a reasonable degree of material prosperity and where class or sectional divisions are not intense. Further, some security from the prospect of foreign aggression is necessary in order to permit the luxury of active opposition which attempts to frustrate the policies of the government. War, or the imminence of war always acts to curtail freedom and open opposition becomes next door to treason.

In spite of experiencing all the disadvantages mentioned in the above extract, India seems to be well on its way to establishing a working democracy. At the time of partition anarchy reigned supreme. The Government of India succeeded in putting an end to it and restoring order. A new Government with Cabinet responsibility was establised. A successful war was fought in Kashmir. There was a Communist insurrection which was promptly put down. Millions of refugees were rehabilitated. The most difficult task of absorbing the princely states into the Indian Union was accomplished. A new constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly was adopted. Elections were held and the governments both at the Centre and in the States began to function with a Cabinet form of Government. These successes, which at first sight seem almost incredible, are clear enough proof of the mettle of the nation.

The question whether Indian democracy will be on all fours with the British or American type of democracy is often posed. And the following statement of Jawaharlal Nehru is added as proof of the unsuitability of Western mode of democracy to Indian conditions :

> Democracy is something deeper than a political form of government—voting, election, etc. In the ultimate analysis, it is a manner of thinking, a manner of action, a manner of behaviour to your neighbour.... If the inner content is absent and you are just given the outer shell, well, it may not be

> successful. I do not know whether I am prepared to say that the same type of democratic institution is suited to every country . . . . In the final analysis, you come back not to political terms, not to economic terms, but to some human terms, or if you like, spiritual terms.

From this it cannot be argued that Nehru himself had no idea of what form of government was suited to India, for the Constitution of India had defined the form of Indian Government. To all intents and purposes, Nehru was only trying to emphasize the idea that democracy is a way of life and under Indian conditions its mode may have to change. It matters very little what changes are made in the mode of democracy so long as the essentials are preserved. There is every reason to hope that democracy will be firmly implanted in India. At present the Government of India looks like "one party government" but in time a powerful opposition party may be built up.

In the general elections of 1967 the position of the Congress Party was shaken in some state assemblies such as those of Tamil Nadu, Kerala and West Bengal, though it got into the Parliament in sufficient strength to form a stable government. In the five general elections to the Parliament, the world's largest electorate has shown its belief in democracy. However, the critic is likely to say that in India political power and influence have not spread uniformly amongst all classes. But is there any country in the world where they have so spread? There is no gainsaying the fact that most of the Indian people have become truly political and have understood the power that democracy gives them. Indira Gandhi has been subjected to greater adverse criticism than either Jawaharlal Nehru or Lal Bahadur Shastri. It is true that she rebelled against the old guard to go her way in implementing her policy of socialism by nationalizing all the big banks and general insurance; by abolishing the privy purses of princes and the privileges of the ICS and by supporting lower land ceilings. She broke off from the old guard led by Nijalingappa, Morarji Desai and Kamaraj mainly because she did not like what appeared to her to be their paternalistic or patronizing attitude towards her. Here is what she says about

democracy :

> We have chosen the path of democracy because it gives the maximum opportunity for the growth of the individual and for his participation in the affairs of the nation—in short it leads to political maturity. Maturity has been characterized as both the willingness and ability to accept responsibility. Democracy can only succeed if there is voluntary restraint and adjustment to the economic needs of the country. No political party can survive unless it can appreciate the viewpoint of the vast numbers of the under-privileged who affirm that no one has the right to demand the kind of life that pleases him, or even that which might give him the greatest scope for development, regardless of the needs of others.

One of the most important characteristics of the Government of India is its secularism. We have already observed how Nehru showed his grit by spurning all attempts to make India a Hindu state.

India's attempt at economic development through the Five Year Plans has been described. Equitable distribution of wealth is a thing to be striven after. Sometimes the term "economic equality" is used in this connection. This is a figment of imagination. There is no country in the world that has attained economic equality among its people. Whatever the form of government—democratic, totalitarian or communist—inequalities in the possession of the good things of this world are bound to exist. The problem in India is grovelling poverty. There is no country in the world perhaps, where poverty is so distressing as in India. To pull up the standard of life of poor people is the most important aim of the Five Year Plans of India. It takes time to show tangible results in this direction.

Indian socialism is another point that lends itself to conflicting interpretations. There are hundreds of definitions of socialism and it is futile to attempt at an exhaustive description of the Indian form of socialism. It should, however, be pointed out that it is not communism at all. Communist China started its planned economy almost at the same time as India. China's

methods have been marked by fiats, coercion and forced labour. India believes in persuasion and in the willing cooperation of the people in implementing her Plans. Indian socialism is confined to state ownership in key industries and follows the principles of a welfare state. The individual's freedom is not curtailed as under communism. Controls, permits and licenses so much condemned by opposition parties have purely an economic background and mistakes made may be corrected.

In the eyes of law all are equal, irrespective of caste, creed, religion or sex. In the discussions relating to social uplift the term "social-equality" is often used. What this means is not clear. Inequalities in social status are bound to exist, whether the country is communist or democratic. Objectionable features such as untouchability have been removed by law. It will take time for people in rural areas to do away with residential segregation. The law allows inter-caste marriages. To that extent there is social equality. But it will take a long time for such marriages to become common. Even in Western countries where there is individual freedom to marry, marriages are generally restricted to families of more or less equal social status, or are governed by hereditary considerations. Very rarely does a mistress of a house permit her son to marry a parlour maid on grounds of social equality.

India is a country that has a tradition of reverencing men of character and worth in spite of their poverty. Respect for wealth is an innovation in India. Caste barriers in respect of social intercourse have almost disappeared. A new social order is in the process of being built up. The final form, whatever it be, is bound to have certain peculiar characteristics which may be different from what may be normal in Western society. Cellular as the structure of Indian society is, Indians have long been accustomed to the idea of separate and parallel living. This may be startling to a Westerner who visits India for the first time. But Indians themselves have found nothing repellant in it. Social integration of such a society should be attempted with great caution. Legislation is definitely harmful, but public opinion will be effective.

Everything possible is being done to pull up the economically

and educationally backward communities in India. We have already seen how even the constitution of India has been amended to give special opportunities for the backward sections of the community, so that they may catch up with the educationally advanced section of the community. The Government of India believes that the future of the country lies in the development of human resources, and education is the process by which character, ability and occupational skill can be brought to the masses. Attempts are being made to gear education on to the needs of a developing country.

India started on her democratic career under circumstances more favourable than any other Asian nation that attained independence in recent years. She has potentialities of bringing about a wholesome combination of materialistic ideals and spiritual ideals in the pursuit of excellence.

The world is still divided into military blocs. One is the Communist bloc led by the USSR and the other is the Democratic bloc led by the U.S.A. China is a third Centre of power. Communism is no cementing force as may be seen from China being at loggerheads with the USSR. Difference in political or social ideology seems now to be less a force for dividing nations than divergence in economic nationalism. However, the recent trend in world politics shows that the rival blocs realize the need for tolerance and are ready to accept co-existence. Former enemies seem to make friends with one another. Nixon's visits, some time before his second election to the Presidentship of the U.S.A., to Peking and Moscow show the overwhelming influence of national interest. But still military organizations such as the SEATO and NATO continue to function. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are vying with each other to pile up deadly weapons of war. They are using their surplus wealth in competetive excursions into outer space. China has grown to be the third big power in the world.

The European Common Market and other similar regional market show the recognition of interdependence of contiguous nations for maintaining satisfactory material prosperity. At present the British and the United States governments are forced to put a ceiling on trade and aid because of balance of payments difficulties. This shows that affluent societies are looking in-

ward. They are still not prepared to buy the manufactured goods of the developing countries. As Gunnar Myrdal points out, the play of the forces of the market tends to increase rather than to decrease the inequalities among the nations of the world. India has not only to create an industrial economy but also to build up and hold together an enduring national structure. The rivalries among super powers for spheres of influence on land and sea reinforce the truth of the statement that to live in peace is to be prepared for war. India with her principles of non-aggression and co-existence has to exercise great caution and circumspection in building up her international relationships. At home political parties hold widely varying socio-economic ideologies and predispositions towards foreign nations, so that internal dissentions militate against national unity. Indira Gandhi's stewardship of the nation is beset with difficult problems which require a large amount of give-and-take for their solution. It is hoped that powerful nations will realize that helping India to preserve her independence and territorial integrity is necessary to make democratic socialism safe in the Asiatic region.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Indo-Pakistan Conflict

1. THE KASHMIR WAR

THE hope that with the establishment of a cease-fire line in Rann of Kutch the Indo-Pakistan conflict would be resolved by peaceful negotiation soon turned into an illusion. Kutch was only a symptom of Pakistan's hatred for India and her determination to wrest Kashmir from India by force. After the Chinese invasion of India in 1962, Pakistan began to follow the politico-military tactics of the Chinese against India. Cease-fire violations in Kashmir, adopting the method of guerilla warfare, became a common feature. There were 448 cease-fire violations in Kashmir in 1963, 1,522 in 1964 and over 1,800 in 1965 to the end of July. In April 1965, Pakistan's aggressive policy met with a serious setback in Kutch, but she sought to achieve her object by cutting Srinagar-Leh road. As this is India's life line to Laddakh, India replied by the Military occupation of two important Pakistani posts overlooking Kargil (16 May 1965). When the U.N. assured India of a closer watch by its military observers over this crucial sector, she withdrew her armies from the two Pakistani posts.

Pakistani documents that fell into the hands of Indian military officials gave clear proof of Pakistan's deliberate plan of seizing Kashmir. This put India on her guard. When armed Pakistanis in civilian clothes crossed the cease-fire line in thousands and mixed with the native population of Kashmir on the Indian side, the second invasion of Kashmir may be said to have begun (4 August, 1965). Muslims gave the infiltrators no quarter, and the Indian army men dealt severely with such as they were able to recognize as infiltrators. Pakistan propaganda was that Kashmir Muslims were in revolt to liberate their homeland from the grip of India. The trouble created by the infiltrators was represented as the result of the action committee and the plebiscite front in Kashmir. The press in the West too readily gave publicity to the Pakistani version of the conflict, paying little attention to Indian information. In Srinagar, 8 August was the annual festival day of Pir Dastgir Sahib, a local saint. Pakistani infiltrators hoped to join the pilgrim crowd and make that day the day of Kashmir's deliverance from India. But the invasion miscarried. Scattered groups of infiltrators could do nothing when they could not get the active support of their co-religionists in Kashmir. However, the Pakistan radio broadcast what was expected to happen as something that had already happened, and the pro-Pakistani press in the West gave prominent publicity to Pakistan's untruths and half-truths. That 8-9 August passed quietly in Srinagar is an indisputable fact though a sore disappointment to Pakistan. Srinagar, whose fall had been imminent, was safe in the hands of India.

Pakistan's deliberate intention to cut the Srinagar-Leh road, perhaps as a friendly gesture to China, demanded a firm reply from India. On 15 August India recaptured the two mountain features overlooking Kargil that she had vacated earlier and also occupied another vital post to prevent Pakistan from doing mischief in that "highly sensitive sector".

On the night of 14 August occurred an incident which reveals the Pakistani way of twisting facts. Some raiders got into within a few miles of Srinagar and set fire to Batmalu, a suburb of the capital. "Pakistani radio broadcast this jubilantly but later insisted that the Indian army had set fire to this quarter when it

realized that its confession of arson was not going to be kindly received by those who had been rendered homeless."[1]

It became necessary for India to seal all important routes of infiltration into the Indian side of Kashmir. The capture of Haji Pir on 28 August "was a bold swift manoeuvre skilfully executed" by the Indian army. Counter-attacks were beaten back and on 10 September the Indian army completed the control of the Uri-Poonch link, 'a splendid achievement'. By now Pakistan's miscalculations came to her. But she kept on not only denying knowledge of infiltrators but passing off their activities as those of the 'freedom fighters'.

The Pak rulers' image of India was that it was weak and flabby; it had a vacillating leadership; it was defended by an ill-equipped army lacking physical strength and mental courage. They thought that man to man the Pakistani soldier was infinitely superior to the Indian. They were certain of the support of their friends in the West. Their membership in the SEATO and the Baghdad pact made them feel sure of the support of their co-members. More than all they heavily leaned on the probable support of their co-religionists in Kashmir and India. As the cruel hand of destiny had taken away Jawaharlal Nehru, a towering personality in international circles, they thought that his successor Lal Bahadur Shastri would not be able to rise to the height of a conflict with Pakistan, the ally of China that had defeated India in 1962. It was with such a psychological background that the rulers of Pakistan precipitated the Indo-Pak conflict over the Kashmir issue. But all their myths were exploded by the stern realities of the battlefield. As a top-ranking Canadian put it : "Lal Bahadur Shastri showed himself to be a man with an iron backbone in India's critical hour." Shastri boldly declared that India would be constrained to pursue the counter-action against Pak raiders even beyond the cease-fire line if that became necessary. When the situation demanded it he courageously said: "Brave Jawans! March! There is Nothing to Fear."

The Indian army crossed the pakistan border in the Lahore

[1] B. G. Verghese, *The Times of India*, dated 13-10-1965.

sector (6 September). At the same time the IAF made tactical strikes against a number of military targets. The West which had so far been standing by silent now hastened to describe the new development as an Indian invasion of Pakistan.

Without getting into the details of the Indian attack we may say that within a short time the result was as India had expected. Enemy pressure on Akhnoor was immediately relieved. This was somewhat staggering both to Pakistan and her supporters.

Indian offensive in Lahore sector was carried up to the Ichogil canal. The Indian force discovered that in this area Pakistan had built up military structures which should have taken her some years. Here was clear proof of Pakistan's preparation for war with India for a considerably long time. In the Lahore sector the battle swayed between the Indian border and Ichogil canal with attack and counter-attack. At the time of the cross-fire the Indian forces were spread along the entire length of the canal and in occupation of the strong point of Dograi and Burki. The war in this sector gave the impression that India sought to capture Lahore but was unable to do so. This view is mistaken. India's object was not to conquer territory in Pakistan but to destroy enemy's war potential and military machine. To capture territory to be given back later would only be a waste of men and ammunition. The war had a broad front and fighting went on all along the border with varying intensity.

Two battles led to enemy rout. One was at Asal-uttar and other at Phillora. While the armies battled on the ground the air forces of both countries sought for mastery of the air. The IAF tried to draw the PAF into battle; but the PAF studiously avoided the challenge and indulged in indiscriminate bombing. The IAF took a heavy toll of enemy aircraft. On the evidence of military experts it may be said that the IAF played its part admirably well in the following roles: ground attack in support of the Indian army; air cover; interdiction of enemy movements and supplies; air defence; the bombing of enemy air bases and aerial reconnaissance.

The exotic interlude of the Chinese in the Indo-Pakistan conflict afforded more amusement than serious concern at the time. They issued a three-day ultimatum to India on 16

September 1965. Their allegations were, first, that there were Indian military structures on the Tibet side of the Sikkim-Tibet border; and secondly, that the Indians had committed the 'theft' of fifty-nine yak and 800 sheep. That these charges were fraudulent was quite apparent to everybody. The Chinese rulers, of their own accord, extended the ultimatum for three more days and then dramatically withdrew it. Chinese armies marched up and down several passes and Indian posts in Sikkim. After indulging in desultory firing in Ladakh and Sikkim they announced to the World that India had dismantled the military structures which existed only in the imagination of the Chinese. Why did China do all this? Maybe she wanted to frighten India. But India refused to grow panicky although some other powers seemed a trifle concerned. Maybe the Chinese ultimatum was a move to encourage Pakistan to continue her war with India. Perhaps China intended to frighten the Security Council with the possibility of the involvement of great powers in the War so that it might call a halt to the war which was unmistakably going against Pakistan. Whatever might have been the motive of the Chinese rulers, their rapid climb-down meant a loss of their prestige.

India was satisfied that her primary object of blunting Pakistan's war machine had been achieved and so she was ready to accept a cease-fire from 8.30 P.M. on 14 September as originally proposed by U Thant. But Pakistan wavered. The Chinese ultimatum did not give Pakistan the desired leverage. She wanted that a political settlement of Kashmir should immediately follow cease-fire. India refused to permit any discussion on the political settlement declaring that Kashmir was an integral part of India and therefore such a discussion should be beyond the purview of the UNO as it was an internal affair of the country. Some hours after the expiry of the extended Chinese ultimatum to India on the evening of 22 September Pakistan accepted cease-fire and it came into effect in the early hours of 23 September.

The name, Kashmir, which under ordinary circumstances should stir up visions of natural beauty, has from the point of view of geopolitics acquired an emotive power not only in

Pakistan and India but also in the two blocs into which the world is divided. The Indo-Pakistan war has given glimpses into the attitude of the West towards India. It was India that was hit harder when the U.S.A. and the U.K. stopped military supplies with an air of impartiality to the belligerents during the period of war. The impression that Indian embassies had not effectively presented the Indian point of view in foreign countries, particularly in the U.S.A. and U.K., is not wholly right. It is natural for the U.K. to regard Pakistan, in the creation of which she had a lion's share, as her protege. The U.S.A. in her desire to contain communism in the Asiatic region wants to be soft to Pakistan to wean her away from China. The U.S.A. seems to think that Kashmir as a part of India, a non-aligned country, would not be so helpful for the establishment of military bases in the hour of dire need as it would be if it were under Pakistan or under international control.

The great powers were chary of getting involved deeply in the dispute; Russia had generally befriended India, though not being unfriendly to Pakistan. Through the good offices of Russia, Indian and Pakistani leaders met at Tashkent early in 1966 to find a way of establishing friendly and mutual relations between them. It was in this hour of triumph that Lal Bahadur Shastri, the then Prime Minister of India, died of heart-failure plunging India and the world into sorrow. The Kashmir war and Tashkent conference made President Ayub Khan unpopular.

2. INDIA AND THE EMERGENCE OF BANGLADESH

In 1947, the Eastern and Western Wings of Pakistan, lying a thousand miles apart, started on their career with wide cultural differences and acute economic imbalances. The weaker of the two was East Pakistan. In 1948, at a meeting in Dacca, Jinnah said that Pakistan would have only one national language and that would be Urdu. At that time 55 million Pakistanis spoke Bengali (now nearly 75 million in Bangladesh) and only 6 million of West Pakistan people spoke Urdu. Jinnah was howled down by the Bengali audience and scores of them were

put in prison for the disrespect shown to the founder of Pakistan. This was the seed of the conflict that ultimately resulted in the emergence of Bangladesh.

The rulers of Pakistan and the rich elite of West Pakistan have all along been light-heartedly disregarding East Pakistanis' sentiments and criminally neglecting their economic sufferings. Prosperous East Bengal under the unbenevolent rule of the British merchants became afflicted with penury and since then has been the scene of abysmal poverty and explosive population, frequent floods and cyclones, intermittent famines and epidemics. Owing to population pressure East Pakistan has, for some years, been unable to feed its own people. The typical family income of Pakistan is said to be a rupee a day. Unemployment is acute. "East Pakistan is the majority wing, with about 55 per cent of Pakistan's total population and it has consistently earned two-third of Pakistan's foreign exchange with its exports of jute and tea. Nevertheless, it has annually received less than a third of its nation's imports, less than half of its development funds and less than a quarter of its foreign aid. Its per capita income is only two-third of that in the West Wing. The West Wing with a smaller population has nearly four times as many hospital beds and has had three times as many polytechnic institutes."[2]

Pakistan was unfortunate in its initial loss of leadership. M.A. Jinnah, to whose brilliant intellect, indefatigable energy and extraordinary skill in debate Pakistan owed its origin, died on 11 September 1948. Liaquat Ali Khan, an experienced administrator and diplomat, worthily succeeded Jinnah. He was murdered on 15 October 1951. Experiments in any democratic form of government proved a failure. Under chaotic political conditions the army took over the reins of government in bloodless *coup d'etat* on 7 October 1958. Ayub Khan became President and brought Pakistan under Martial Law. In 1962, Ayub gave Pakistan a Constitution embodying 'basic democracy' and Martial Law was lifted and the New Assembly was allowed to function. In the full-scale war with India (1965), State

[2] David Loshak, *Pakistan Crisis*, p. 22.

Emergency regulations were passed. After Tashkent agreement (January 1966) there was a virulent anti-government agitation in both the wings against one man rule.

Under the Presidentship of Ayub Khan (October 1958-March 1969) Bengalis were scrupulously kept out of all key posts in the Central Civil Service at Islamabad, in the diplomatic service and in the judiciary. In the higher ranks of the army there was only one Bengali out of ten officers. In irrigation projects West Pakistan had the lion's share of the budgetted amount. Briefly stated there was a deliberate policy of creating a 'have' West Wing and 'have-not' East Wing, demonstrating the self-interested callousness by the rich pressure groups of the West Wing.

There was a nationwide general strike to protest against Ayub's dictatorial rule. Emergency regulations were lifted in February 1969. At a Round Table Conference attended by leaders, important among whom were Bhutto of West Pakistan and Mujib of East Pakistan (13 March 1969), Ayub agreed to parliamentary government and direct elections. However, mass strikes and disturbances continued. Troops were moved to guard all main installations and vital points. There was anarchy in East Pakistan. President Ayub resigned (25 March 1969). Yahya Khan, Commander-in-Chief, became the President and restored Martial Law order; he tried to please the Bengalis by appointing them to higher posts in the Central Civil Service. From the start he disdained any political ambition and promised restoration of Civil Government, which did not find favour with a large section of army officers and powerful industrial magnates of the West Wing. People in East Pakistan felt that they were not considered equal partners in the government of Pakistan and that they had no control over the affairs of their province. The Awami League, the strongest political party in East Pakistan under the leadership of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, drafted a six-point demand as the basis for the solution of East Pakistan's problems. The six points demanded :

(1) The establishment of a federal form of government, with a parliament, to be the supreme point of power, directly

elected by universal adult suffrage.

(2) The federal government would control only defence and foreign policy, leaving all other subjects to the federating states of East and West Pakistan.

(3) The two wings would have separate (but freely convertible) currencies or, if one currency, separate fiscal policies to prevent the flight of capital from East to West Pakistan.

(4) The federal government would have no powers of taxation. It would share in state taxes for the needs of foreign and defence affairs.

(5) Each of the federating states would have the power to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries. They would also have full control over their earned foreign exchange.

(6) The States would have their own militias or paramilitary forces.

West Pakistani leaders argued that the Federal Government would be feeble and unworkable if its control was restricted to defence and foreign policy. Separate currencies and separate economies would create chaos. To allow the East Wing to trade with India was in contradiction to the Federal policy because of the unsolved Kashmir problem. If the East Wing became economically independent, the status of the army would be totally undermined. The six points were quite unacceptable to West Pakistan, but they were the least which East Pakistan could demand. It was the massive East Pakistan demand for the six points that brought Ayub Khan down. Throughout Yahya Khan's rule these points were persistently pressed. On the question of East Pakistan's autonomy Yahya said: "It is entirely for the elected representatives of the people to decide what they want."

The six-point programme was the election pledge of the Awami League which won a majority in the National Assembly. Bhutto's People's Party had an absolute majority in the Punjab and Sind Provincial Assemblies, while in the National Assembly it captured 86 seats coming next to the Awami League. President Yahya went so far as to describe Mujib as 'Pakistan's next

Prime Minister'. The National Assembly was scheduled to meet in early March 1971. Z. A. Bhutto visited Dacca and held discussion with Mujibur Rahman to come to an understanding on basic issues. Mujib refused to budge from six-point programme (20 December 1970). Thereupon Bhutto threatened to withdraw from constitution-making process and demanded postponement of the Central Assembly under threat of massive commercial and industrial 'bandhs' in the whole of West Pakistan. It suited Yahya Khan to postpone indefinitely the Pakistan National Assembly Session. In February 1971 President Yahya dismissed the civilian cabinet. He convened a meeting of military governors, finding that the threat to law and order began to deepen. Mujib retaliated by calling for a general strike in Dacca. The strike spread to the whole of East Pakistan and for a week disrupted normal life. President Yahya invited all political leaders to Round Table Conference. Mujib rejected the invitation. In spite of it, Yahya refixed Assembly convening for 25 March 1971. Mujib refused to attend Assembly unless President Yahya agreed to a series of pre-conditions such as the lifting of the Martial Law Order. He announced civil disobedience movement. It must be noted that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman had never advocated secession but he was forced to it by the West Pakistan attitude. The civil disobedience movement began. Mujibur Rahman made it clear that unless and until the just demands of the Awami League were considered, all government offices in East Bengal would remain closed and taxes and rents would not be paid. This was on 8 March 1971. The next day East Pakistan judges including the Chief Justice refused to swear in Lt. Gen. Tikka Khan, the New Military Governor. Yahya Khan denounced Sheikh Mujib as a traitor, banned the Awami League and issued stiff new series of Martial Law Directives. There was a rigorous clamp down on the reporting of developments inside Pakistan. On 16 April 1971 the army had complete grip over East Pakistan. Mujibur Rahman boldly took over the administration.

President Yahya, after a series of talks with leading politicians, promised (28 July 1969) general elections within 18 months.

He openly declared that dissatisfaction in East Pakistan was "fully justified". In August 1969, ten civilian Cabinet Ministers including five from East Pakistan were sworn in. 5 October 1970 was announced to be the date of general election on the basis of one man one vote. This would give East Pakistan a built-in majority. Yahya said that provincial autonomy must be consistent with a strong federal government at the Centre. All political restrictions were lifted and parties could resume full activity. There was Legal Framework Order which gave detailed blue-print for return to civilian governments.

In August 1970 monsoon rains were exceptionally heavy. Millions of acres were inundated. A hundred people and uncounted hundreds of livestock were drowned. As many as 95,000 homes were destroyed, and about 250,000 hutments were submerged. Epidemic spread. Crops were damaged over an area of 1,500 square miles. Roads and bridges were wrecked.

Yahya visited Dacca and toured the flooded area. He declared that the general elections would be postponed to 7 December due to widespread flooding in East Pakistan. This was interpreted as his reluctance to part with power. The Central Government did nothing to help the people affected by the flood. Sheikh Mujib denounced West Pakistan for its callous disregard of Bengali sufferings. Yahya's defence of his government carried no conviction. On the night of 12 November 1970 East Pakistan was affected by an unprecedentedly severe cyclone. Inadequacy of government relief measures came to be cited as the most serious failing of the West Wing. Yahya was told that on no account he should postpone the general elections.

As scheduled the general elections took place on 7 December 1970. This gave a sweeping victory to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's Awami League in East Pakistan. The Awami League got 167 out of the 169 East Pakistan seats. This gave Mujibur an absolute majority in both the National assembly and in the East Pakistan Provincial Assembly. Mujib issued a series of Directives amounting to a declaration of autonomy for the Eastern Wing. 23 March 1971, Pakistan's Republic Day, became the resistance day in East Pakistan. On 25 March the army laun-

ched a mass attack on Awami League students, Hindus and Bengalis generally. The Bengali elements in the army and the police mutinied. Sheikh was put under arrest at his residence and at dead night he was secretly removed to West Pakistan. But the East Pakistanis carried on their unequal struggle against the brutal repression of the West Pakistani Army. A Provisional Government was formed. The Liberation Forces of Bangladesh continued their determined struggle against the onslaughts of Pakistani Army, Air Force and Navy actively helped by the U.S.A. and China with sophisticated modern weapons of mass destruction. Pakistan's resolve was to eliminate intellectuals and the members of the Awami League, strike terror in the hearts of the people and bring East Pakistan under subjection. To this end the Pakistani Army committed every atrocity on unarmed civilians, resorted to torture, rape, shooting, burning unheared of even under Nazi rule. In self-defence the Bengali Muslims fought with equal ferosity and punished those whom they regarded as the spies and abettors of the military junta.

On 1 April 1971 the new Sovereign Republic of Bangladesh came into existence at a simple and impressive ceremony in a mango grove at Mujibnagar when the declaration of independence as had been drafted by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was solemnly ratified by the elected members of the National Assembly who had assembled there for the purpose. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who was in prison somewhere, was declared the President of the Bangladesh. Bengali members of the diplomatic corps wherever they were defected to Bangladesh. The office of the Pakistan Deputy High Commissioner, Calcutta, became the first diplomatic office in India. The Pakistani Army rapidly reinforced its forces in Bangladesh and fanned out to recapture the towns and strategic points under the Mukti Bahini (Liberation Army). We have no place here for the pitched battles fought between the Pakistani Army and the Mukti Bahini. Nor can we describe the horrors committed by the opposing forces. Pakistani Army had killed more than a million in the most inhuman acts of butchery, rape and arson. Ten million people had to flee for their lives from Bangladesh to India. This was a burden on the finances of India. Refugee camps

were opened and arrangements were made to look after them. The Mukti Bahini took to guerilla warfare and gave no peace to the Pakistani Army. The Indian Parliament unanimously passed a resolution expressing sympathy with and moral support for the people of East Bengal (31 March 1971). There was a systematic and calculated persecution of the people by the Pakistani Army so as to make it impossible for the Bengalis to rebuild their land; driving the terror-stricken Bengalis to go out into India as refugees seemed to have been preplanned to drain the resources of India and to blame the government of India.

When Yahya Khan found the situation in Bangladesh was getting out of control, he fell foul of India and to divert the attention of the West Pakistanis declared war on India (3 December 1971). A state of emergency was declared in India and the Pakistan's challenge was accepted. The Indian Army, Navy and Air Force went into action in a war of two fronts, in a surprisingly short period of 14 days defeated Pakistan and compelled her to sue for peace. Pakistani forces surrendered at Dacca on 16 December 1971. We have no place here for numerous instances of acts of glorious courage and self-sacrifice on the part of the defence services of India, deserving the highest honour. In the Western Sector too there was a cease-fire; 5,690 sq.miles of Pakistan territory was under the occupation of the Indian forces. Pakistan lost 246 tanks, Indian army and the Mukti Bahini took 93,000 of Pakistani soldiers as prisoners. Indian losses were comparatively small. There was a distressing disclosure of the inadequacy of the Indian intelligence system.

Bangladesh became a reality. India was the first to recognize Bangladesh on 6 December 1971 followed by Bhutan the next day. By now a large number of nations in the world have accorded recognition to Bangladesh including the U.S.A. which had chosen to treat Pakistan atrocity as normal internal matters of sovereign Pakistan. The Muslim nations of the Middle East Arab area have not yet recognized Bangladesh though its population is Muslim predominantly. China has not recognized Bangladesh.

During the war the American Seventh Fleet paraded the Indian Ocean adjoining the sub-continent, presumably to frighten India, but India carried on her war operations ignoring its presence. Why the fleet came at all is a mystery. India's victory after only 14 days of war gave proof of India's military potential. President Nixon's antipathy to India and China's inimical feelings became quite patent. It suits the U.S.A. and China to keep the Kashmir problem continuously alive. Pakistan requires the problem for shaping her foreign policy, because without it she can have no foreign Policy. That India under Indira Gandhi's leadership is going nearer and nearer to Russia is a matter of concern not only to the great powers of the West but also to some all-India political parties. The countries of the Arab Union seem to be sullen about the emergence of Bangladesh and are sympathetic to Pakistan.

Z. A. Bhutto whose responsibility is to steer the ship of Pakistan in troubled waters is drawing comfort in the reaction of China and the U.S.A. to the Indo-Pak war (1971). He feels sure of retaining their active support in his designs against India, whatever they might be.

That Bangladesh has shaken off her economic leech, Pakistan, is beyond doubt. A great deal of the future of Bangladesh depends on improving as rapidly as possible her trade, communication, transport and irrigation fecilities with the cooperation of India according to agreement. Mujibur is a bulwark against the injection of Maoism into Bangladesh. India underIndira Gandhi is trying to prove that her socialism is not entirely Russian commuism.

It is said that the emergence of Bangladesh falsifies Jinnah's two-nation theory on the only basis of religion. It may be so, but to speak the truth, a homogeneous sub-continent has become the abode of three nations—the Indians, the Pakistanis and the Bangladesh people. Bangladesh is primarily the result of socio-economic factors transcending religious affiliations. It is to be noted that West Pakistanis and the peoples of the Arab Union somehow or other still look down upon the Bengali Muslims as inferior Muslims, because they feel that the Bengali Muslims' outlook on life is more or less like that of the Hindu. India must know that it cannot

depend too much on the feelings of gratitude of the Bengali Muslims. The great powers know the value of the natural resources of Bangladesh and would certainly want the friendship of Bangladesh to improve their trade and commerce. The progress of the three countries—India, Pakistan and Bangladesh—depends on their unified action for defence and economic improvement. The more the three countries realize that geographically, culturally and economically they form an indivisible unit, the better will it be for themselves and for the world.

Alone among Islamic countries of the Asian region, Bangladesh has started on its career as a democratic country. It has embraced secularism. It would be well if Pakistan realized that a theocratic state is an anachronism in modern science. Bangladesh is now admitted as an observer into the UNO. But for the Chinese veto at the Security Council it would have been a fullfledged member of the UNO. The time is not far off when Bangladesh would be admitted as a member of the UNO. Bangladesh will take its place in the comity of nations under the leadership of Mujibur who by instinct is a liberal.

4. SIMLA AGREEMENT

On 16 December 1971 the Pakistani Army under Lt. General Niazi at Dacca surrendered to the Army Chief of India, Maneckshaw. With it the liberation of Bangladesh was accomplished. The next day India ordered a unilateral cease-fire on the Western Front. With some hesitation Pakistan accepted it. India and Pakistan agreed to a bilateral settlement of the disputes. At the end of a five day summit meeting (28 June-2 July 1972) at Simla they agreed to settle all their differences peacefully. This has come to be called Simla Agreement (Vide Appendix D for the text of agreement).

Both the countries have committed themselves to peaceful co-existence, respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty of each other and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. For the restoration of normal relations, they pledged themselves to resume communications, promote travel facilities, cooperate in

economic and allied matters and have exchanges in cultural and scientific affairs. To facilitate the establishment of durable peace each of the two contracting parties agreed to withdraw its forces to its side of the international border in the Punjab and Rajasthan regions. In Jammu and Kashmir the position that obtained after the 1971 cease-fire is to continue and neither side will seek to alter it unilaterally or by force. It is also agreed to have further summit meets as occasion demands. The agreement was signed by Indira Gandhi and Z. A. Bhutto at 1 a.m. on 2-3 July 1972.

What this agreement means to India will unfold itself in the future. This was the first summit after a lapse of 25 years at which India and Pakistan settled down to resolve their differences peacefully. To have brought about it at all is no small achievement of the Government of India. The agreement is welcomed not only in India but also abroad. However, some critics say that the Simla Agreement is heavily weighted in favour of Pakistan with no corresponding advantage to India. The criticism may be summed up thus : These are the days of rapid and easy means of communication between countries, no matter how distant; therefore the possibilities of the parties meeting for bilateral talks with preset views after consultation with their friends cannot be ruled out; past experience of Pakistan in relation to India makes it impossible to expect Pakistan to practise principles of Panchsheel embodied in the agreement.

India should not have given away the occupied territories in Pakistan. It is not right to grudge the return of territory under military occupation. In the Indo-Pak war of 1965 Lal Bahadur Shastri said that India never had any territorial ambition in Pakistan. The aim of that war was to thwart the aggression of Pakistan. When that was achieved he thought it proper to give back to Pakistan the territory that belonged to it. In the 1971 war India's main aim was to liberate Bangladesh according to the Human Rights enunciated by the UNO. When that aim had been realized, India gave back to Pakistan the territories under her occupation in consonance with Lal Bahadur Shatsri's policy.

Even those who regard Simla Agreement as a correct step ask

how India is going to ensure the faithful implementation of the agreement and make a beginning in the establishment of a durable peace in the sub-continent. Pakistani spokesmen have put their own interpretation on the basic principles of the agreement, such as bilateralism and peaceful methods of settling disputes step by step. This makes the task really difficult. As Appadurai points out, the Simla Agreement has no sanction to ensure its implementation except the sincere willingness of the parties to implement it. What will happen if it is not implemented? Is it the use of force lying outside the agreement?

Pakistan's bone of contention is Kashmir. Bhutto has openly said that through the Simla Agreement the Kashmir question has been activated, while India's Minister for External Affairs asserts that Kashmir's accession to India is final. A considerable part of Kashmir is still in the illegal occupation of Pakistan. What the Simla Agreement can claim is that Pakistan has agreed that this issue too would be solved through peaceful methods. India has insisted on the dividing line in Kashmir being the one that obtained at the end of the 1971 war. Decision over this is still in the melting pot. Krishna Menon, former Minister for Defence, clearly said that Kashmir was India's sovereign territory and that Pakistan should vacate its aggression. In 1955 Nehru told Pakistani leaders that India had no design to take "the part of Kashmir which is under you by fighting". Does the Simla Agreement give any promise of getting back the illegally occupied territory without fighting? To expect Pakistan to surrender voluntarily to India the territory under its occupation is really too much. India Government's stand on this point has not yet been clear.

However conflicting may be the views of Indian politicians on the possible outcome of Simla Agreement, they cannot detract the decidedly improved image of India abroad, as a result of the glorious victory in the Indo-Pak war. Well may the Indian nation be proud of their country's successful lead of the forces of freedom and human dignity in the liberation of Bangladesh in a surprisingly short time.

In his Foreign Policy Report to Congress on 9 February

1972 President Nixon called India 'one of Asia's major powers.' He claimed that, "it was a foregone conclusion that if war broke out India would win." The 1971 war has demonstrated that India dominates its own region, South Asia. "The recently ratified Simla Treaty included clauses that signify India's superior posture with regard to the major international dispute in the region, Kashmir. Under the Treaty Pakistan agreed to settle its 'differences' with India "by peaceful means through bilateral negotiation..." and undertook (with India) "to refrain from the threat or use of force in violation" of the Kashmir cease-fire line. This is the diplomatic way of saying that it will no longer try to challenge India's position by calling in help from outside and thus accepts its inferiority of power vis-a-vis India. The implications of those clauses in the Treaty have not been lost on anyone, in particular Pakistani critics of the agreement".[4]

However, India's incapacity to control the Indian Ocean should be a matter of concern to the nation. We shall deal with it in the next chapter.

[4] Charles H. Heimsath in the article on "India and the Asian Balance of Power," *India and the World*, p. 206.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

Geopolitics—a Perspective

We have observed that India, from pre-historic times to the present day, has been a part of universal history. Especially after independence in 1947 India has become important in world affairs. Nehru saw India as the emerging 'giant' of world affairs, able to stand on an equal footing with any other nation. It was the independence of India that paved the way for the political freedom of other Afro-Asian nations. The new independent nations soon learned that more freedom from imperialism was no cure for their age-long economic disabilities. Increased dependence on rich nations for agricultural and industrial development and national defence has militated against self-help and initiative. Unfortunately they have been too jealous and suspicious of one another to take concerted measures for cooperative efforts. India has, however, been making some spectacular progress.

Discussing the question of the readjustment of the relations between Asia and Europe Nehru wrote :

When we talk of Asia, remember that India, not because of

any ambition of hers, but because of the force of circumstances, because of geography, because of history, and because of so many other things, inevitably has to play a very important part in Asia. And not only that; India becomes a kind of meeting ground for various trends and forces and a meeting ground between what might roughly be called the East and the West.

Look at the map. If you have to consider any question affecting the Middle East, India inevitably comes into the picture. If you have to consider any question concerning South East Asia, you cannot do so without India. So also with the Far East. While the Middle East may not be directly connected with South East Asia, both are connected with India. Even if you think in terms of regional organization in Asia, you have to keep in touch with the other regions. And whatever regions you may have in mind, the importance of India cannot be ignored.[1]

Asian countries in general are at present primarily concerned with problems of food, of clothing, of education and of health. All of them except People's China are not concerned with problems of power politics as are the Western countries. They are keenly aware that they are far behind the Western countries in terms of power and technological growth. While the Asian countries are engaged in the difficult task of economic reconstruction, they find that of necessity, they have to get themselves involved in international affairs. Circumstances have compelled them to align themselves with one or other of the super powers.

The Second World War ended creating more problems than it attempted to solve. Two great countries, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. emerged as giants into the world. From the time of cessation of hostilities to about 1970 there were fundamental ideological differences between them. While both the countries recognized the equality of man and the need for social justice, the

[1] *Independence and After*, p. 231. See also *Sources of Indian Tradition* (2nd ed.).

U.S.A. stood for private enterprise and the U.S.S.R. for collectivism. These two spilt the world into two blocs. Russia tried to gather adherents by demonstrating her theories by experiment. The U.S.A., the first nuclear power, tried to gather followers through a planned programme of assistance to developing countries. She formed such organizations as the NATO, the SEATO and CENTO to contain Communism. Russia, the second nuclear power, seemed amenable to the principle of co-existence. China with the help of Russia became the third nuclear power and began to stride over Asia like a colossus with the object of spreading into her by insidious persuasion and naked violence, if necessary. Russian Communism is largely in conformity with the teaching of Marx and Lenin that revolution must begin with industrial and other workers in towns and cities. Against this Mao Tse-Tung of China has taught that revolution in Asia should begin with the peasants in the villages and should go from thereon to towns and cities. His teaching is known as Maoism whose contribution to political practice is the technique of guerilla warfare not only for defence against a foreign enemy but also against political parties of one's own nation. The National interests of both Russia and China clash particularly in outer Mongolia. There is a tremendous concentration of troops of both the countries standing in juxtaposition ready to shoot one another at the behest of their commanders. Modern Chinese history has brought out the fact that between Communism and Nationalism the latter is more effective in stirring up people against their opponents. Events have shown that China's acceptance of Pancha Shila was only a cloak for establishing her hegemony over Asia. For the first time in 1962, after several thousands of years of peaceful cultural contact with India, People's China chose to invade India. After taking what she wanted, she declared a unilateral cease-fire. Pakistan, which ever since its inception has been actively hostile to India, has found an ally in China.

The United Nations Organization is dominated by the big powers in the Security Council each exercising its power of veto according to the exigencies of the situation. With the admission of the newly independent Afro-Asian nations the composition of

the Security Council demands a change for effective representation.

To the hatred, fear and jealousy among the triangular world powers must be attributed the cold war, the undeclared war and the threat of destruction by the use of nuclear weapons. We think that the alignment of smaller nations with one or the other of the two blocs is only a glorified form of mediaeval feudalism. By and large, the Euro-American approach to the problems confronting the present-day world is a legacy of the past conflicts of Europe. Each of the big powers does not want any other to grow more powerful than itself. The smaller nations whether they like it or not have felt obliged to take sides. In this context, Nehru thought that the policy of non-alignment was the only hope for the future of the world; for it opened out the possibility of bridging the gulf between the opposing blocs. M.R. Masani observes that non-alignment has ceased to have any meaning because the situation as conceived by Jawaharlal Nehru—two camps, two blocs—no longer exists today (1972). Indeed everyone is non-aligned including the great powers. Though India still sticks to non-alignment in theory, in practice she has found it necessary to move away from it. But India needs the friendship of all the super powers.

The Himalayas are no longer impregnable. As a result of the withdrawl of European powers from the Indian Ocean region a vacuum has been created. This vacuum should be filled up by the united effort of the Asian countries in the interests of world peace and here India can play an effective role.

I. INDIA AND THE INDIAN OCEAN

In the context of geopolitics the Indian Ocean area comprises the seas and coastal regions extending from the Suez to Vladivostok and from the Cape of Good Hope to New Zealand. South Africa, Australia, the islands that are French dependencies and Portuguese state of Mozambique may well be regarded as Western powers in the Indian Ocean. The three Big powers haunting the ocean are America, Russia and China. Each is suspicious

of the increasing presence of the other in the ocean with a persistent effort to enhance its influence over the countries bordering the ocean. This rivalry only leads to further increase their naval forces, and secure bases for operation over land, sea and air.

Some of the reasons for the presence of super-powers and other powers are as follows:

The new independent countries of the Indian ocean littoral are poor and require economic assistance from the affluent countries for their development. The affluent countries vie with one another to build influence there by giving aid and by other means to gain political and commercial advantages. The countries of the littoral supply many raw materials of strategic importance to developed countries, the most important of which is oil. Japan draws 90 per cent of its oil supplies from the region. Persian gulf contains 70 per cent of the non-Communist world's oil reserves and produces almost about 30 per cent of the world's oil supplies. The main producers of oil in the area in descending order are Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq and Abu Dabi. The importing powers want to ensure that the area does not come under Russian influence which, they fear might, interrupt their supplies. After the closure of the Suez Canal, oil and other trade for Europe has been going by the longer route round South Africa. The Western countries are concerned about the security, in an emergency, of this longer route. The Western nations have vast economic stakes in the Indian ocean in the form of direct and joint holdings, in commercial banking, mineral prospecting and oil concerns throughout the area. They therefore wish to preserve the present political balance in the region to safeguard their investments. Admiral A.K. Chatterji (Retd.) writes: "Vast stretches of the Soviet Union and China lie within the range of the new longer range submarine-launched nuclear ballistic missiles (SLBM) which provide a proportion of the first strike and most of the second strike capability of the Super Powers." The Indian Ocean has become an area for the deployment of missile-submarines of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. Distance prevents the superpowers to take effective anti-submarine measures to check the

activities of the missile-submarines. Hence they are for acquiring bases in the islands scattered in the Indian Ocean.

Britain has an Indian Ocean Territory comprising the island of Aldabra, Farquhar, Desroches and Chagos archipelago. Its presence, though modest, is well spread out. In November 1971 the British Far East Command at Singapore was replaced by ANZUK (Australia-New Zealand-U.K.) force. It has set up a new colony in the uninhabited islands that it has purchased from the Mauritius.

The U.S.A. took over the Bahrein Naval Base from the British in December 1972. Two missile submarines operating from their base at Guam are reported to be on continuous patrol in the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal "with their deadly missiles zeroed on Soviet targets." Soviet warships frequent the Indian Ocean. They have two oceanographic ships and about 40 fishing trawlers which could be used as electronic intelligence vessels. They have a communication station and an air base on the South Yemini island of Scotora. In due course they may send missile submarines to the Bay of Bengal to operate against Chinese targets.

Japan possesses the world's largest mercantile marine, one third of her overseas trade and over 90 per cent of her vital oil supplies come from the Persian gulf through the Malacca straits. She has, therefore, a vital interest in the markets of the countries bordering the Indian Ocean. It is believed that the Japanese could put their navy in the Indian Ocean before 1980. The Americans are persuading Japan to take the place of Britain in the defence of Malasian area.

The principal Soviet aims are to contain the American and Chinese influence in the Indian Ocean area and neutralize the threat from the American missile submarines. She also wishes to encircle China and threaten her with missile submarines in the Bay of Bengal. The Americans are there to contain the Russian influence and to safeguard the regular transit of strategic materials and the flow of oil to the West. As already said they also operate missile submarines against target in the Soviet Union. The Chinese are there to contain the Russian influence and threat. They are building up a strong navy for deployment in the ocean.

The presence of the navies of super powers and others makes the Indian Ocean an area of unhealthy rivalry. Some strategists suggest that the influence of the various navies in the ocean will cancel out one another but this is too much to expect. India has, therefore, to do everything possible to safeguard her legitimate interest in the Indian Ocean. She subscribed to the Lusaka Declaration of December 1971, calling on all powers to respect the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace from which Great Power rivalries as well as bases are excluded. She co-sponsored the UN General Assembly's resolution of December 1971, calling on all powers to maintain the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Surely, it is not possible to keep the navies of the super powers out of the ocean by persuasion or by pious resolutions. India must realize that the navies of the super powers will not leave the ocean altogether. She has to devise methods to meet the challenge in co-operation with the Indian Ocean countries. Mere diplomacy will not do; adequate and

CHAPTER NINETEEN

Conclusion

THE situation in the world of 70s is not the same as that in the 60s. The repercussions of the shift in the foreign policy of the U.S.A. and her bilateral agreements with Russia and China are still to be seen. Though the world is still broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls, these fragments are unavoidably interdependent for their welfare. Our foreign relations have to be built up in recognition of the interdependence.

Commenting on Indira Gandhi's policy Charles H. Heimsath says, "Prime Minister Gandhi disclaims wanting to play 'Power politics'—when this is what she does at home every day—either because it is too dangerous or too dirty. But everyone must be aware that for almost a decade (since the Russian decision to support India in November 1962 against China) India has willingly been dealt into the game of Asian power politics, by helping Russia maintain a balance vis-a-vis China and by receiving help from Russia in return. A larger arena of global power balances has revealed itself in recent years, as the

American and Russian control over world politics has subsided in favour of a more nearly multi-polar system. In that arena India is one of five, may be, six great powers acting upon each other in hostility or collaboration, which taken altogether leads to a balance. Those states are the Soviet Union, China, the U.S.A., India, possibly Japan, and the emergent region of Western Europe."

We do think that India has an important role to play in world affairs. Looking inward we must say that the type of socialism advocated by the New Congress under the leadership of Indira Gandhi has not so far been clearly defined. It is obsessed by two ideas; equality of treatment and equality in the good enjoyed by individuals. Both are difficult to achieve. The first may be regarded as impracticable. Wisdom lies in giving maintenance and welfare in society priority over the achievement of equality in the good enjoyed by all members of the society. Social welfare requires a thorough examination of every distributive arrangement which departs from the ideal of equality. Measures to eliminate those factors in society which, for the present, stand in the way of the welfare of society should be taken. Indira Gandhi's stand is that she is taking such measures at present. But the extent to which these measures have really benefited the have-nots in the society remains unsatisfactory as revealed by the pitifully low per capita income and increasing unemployment, high prices and lack of amenities of life in villages. We have already described the Government's attempts to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor. They have only resulted in placating the envious feelings of the poor towards the rich without giving any concrete help to most of them. Therefore, the distributive system has to be reformed.

On brain-drain Indira Gandhi admits that we cannot yet provide everything required by talented scientists doing advanced work in various branches of knowledge. "Even countries, which are far more advanced than we, are facing the problems of this exodus of junior scientists as well as of leaders of research. The more outstanding of them are men who have a full measure of their creative ability and of the contribution which they can make to knowledge. They are not tempted by

the ordinary blandishments but want to leave their mark on a branch of science, want to contribute and also to learn further, and I think that their concern is with frontiers of knowledge and therefore they do not feel bound by national boundaries." This is really an intelligent explanation of the brain-drain in India. It should not be left at that. Conditions necessary for retaining *talented persons for the service of India and through it to that* of the world should forthwith be brought about.

We have in the foregoing chapters shown that the Indian society recognizes that nothing is static in the universe and that change is a law of nature. Surely the externals of our life keep changing, but as Indira Gandhi observes, "the external values remain constant and steadfast and it is to these that we must anchor our actions and our beliefs."

Appendices

APPENDIX A

States and Union Territories

STATES

Andhra Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Kerala
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mysore
Nagaland
Orissa
Punjab
Rajasthan
Tamil Nadu
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
West Bengal

UNION TERRITORIES

Arunachal Pradesh
Delhi
Goa, Daman and Diu
Mizoram
Pondicherry
Laccadive and Minicoy Islands
Andaman and Nicobar Islands
Chandigarh

APPENDIX B

Amendments to the Constitution Challenged at the Supreme Court

THE Constitution Amendment Acts 24th, 25th, 26th and 29th are challenged at the Supreme Court.

The Constitution Amendment Act 24th was enacted restoring powers to Parliament to amend fundamental rights, subsequent to the Supreme Court's judgement in 1967 in the well-known Golaknath Case (which held that Parliament was not competent to take away or abridge fundamental rights through an amendment of the Constitution).

The 25th Amendment Act was enacted consequent on the Supreme Court's ruling in the Bank Nationalization Case. By this amendment the word "compensation" in Article 31 of the Constitution (dealing with compulsory acquisition of property under authority of law etc.) was replaced by the word "amount" (so that it was not obligatory for the State to provide for payment of compensation on the principle of "just equivalent" of what is acquired in a given law dealing with compulsory acquisition of property for a public purpose etc.).

The 25th Amendment has added a new Clause 31-C which says that if any law is passed to give effect to the Directive Principles contained in Articles 39 (B) and (C) of the Constitution and contains a declaration to that effect, such a law shall not be deemed to be void on the ground that it takes away or abridges any of the fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19 and 31 of the Constitution. Article 14 deals with equality before law etc., while Article 19 deals with what are called personal freedoms like freedom of speech and expression, freedom of association, freedom of movement, freedom to carry on profession and business and also right to hold property etc.

Articles 39 (B) and (C)—figuring in the Directive Principles of the State Policy—say that the "ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good" and that the "operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment."

This 25th Amendment also provides that such a law shall not be called in question on the ground that it takes away any of the fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19 and 31.

The 26th Amendment Act was passed consequent on the Supreme Court's

ruling in Privy Purses case. This amendment was meant to deprive the Rulers of their Privy Purses and privileges by deleting the provisions concerned in the Constitution.

The 29th Amendment Act was passed to include the Kerala Land Reforms Act in the Ninth Schedule to the Constitution (so as to protect this legislation from challenge in courts of law on ground of violation of fundamental rights etc.).

From *The Hindu* dated 1 November 1972

APPENDIX C

Indo-Soviet Treaty

OPERATIVE CLAUSES OF THE TREATY OF PEACE, FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

ARTICLE I

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that enduring peace and friendship shall prevail between the two countries and their peoples. Each Party shall respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the other Party and refrain from interfering in the other's internal affairs. The High Contracting Parties shall continue to develop and consolidate the relations of sincere friendship, good neighbourliness and comprehensive co-operation existing between them on the basis of the aforesaid principles as well as those of equality and mutual benefit.

ARTICLE II

Guided by the desire to contribute in every possible way to ensure enduring peace and security of their people; the High Contracting Parties declare their determination to continue their efforts to strengthen peace in Asia and throughout the world, to halt the arms race and to achieve general and complete disarmament, including both nuclear and conventional, under effective international control.

ARTICLE III

Guided by their loyalty to the lofty ideal of equality of all peoples and nations, irrespective of race or creed, the High Contracting Parties condemn colonialism and racialism in all forms and manifestations, and reaffirm their determination to strive for their final and complete elimination.

The High Contracting Parties shall cooperate with other States to achieve these aims and to support the just aspirations of the people in their struggle against colonialism and racial domination.

ARTICLE IV

The Republic of India respects the peace-loving policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics aimed at strengthening friendship and co-operation with all nations.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics respects India's policy of non-alignment and reaffirms that this policy constitutes an important factor in the maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world.

ARTICLE V

Deeply interested in ensuring universal peace and security, attaching great importance to their mutual co-operation in the international field for achieving those aims, the High Contracting Parties will maintain regular contacts with each other on major international problems affecting the interests of both the States by means of meetings and exchanges of views between their leading statesmen, visits by official delegations and special envoys of the two Governments, and through diplomatic channels.

ARTICLE VI

Attaching great importance to economic, scientific and technological co-operation between them, the High Contracting Parties will continue to consolidate and expand mutually advantageous and comprehensive co-operation in these fields as well as expand trade, transport and communications between them on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and most-favoured-nation treatment, subject to the existing agreements and the special arrangements with contiguous countries as specified in the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement of December 26, 1970.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties shall promote further development of ties and contacts between them in the fields of science, art, literature, education, public health, press, radio, television, cinema, tourism and sports.

ARTICLE VIII

In accordance with the traditional friendship established between the

two countries, each of the High Contracting Parties solemnly declares that it shall not enter into or participate in any military alliance directed against the other Party.

Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from any aggression against the other Party and to prevent the use of its territory for the commission of any act which might inflict military damage on the other High Contracting Party.

ARTICLE IX

Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure and security of their countries.

ARTICLE X

Each High Contracting Party solemnly declares that it shall not enter into any obligation, secret or public, with one or more States which is incompatible with this Treaty. Each High Contracting Party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other Party.

ARTICLE XI

This Treaty is concluded for the duration of twenty years and will be automatically extended for each successive period of five years unless either High Contracting Party declares its desire to terminate it by giving notice to the other High Contracting Party twelve months prior to the expiration of the Treaty. The Treaty will be subject to ratification and will come into force on the date of the exchange of Instruments of Ratification which will take place in Moscow within one month of the signing of this Treaty.

ARTICLE XII

Any difference of interpretation of any Article or Articles of this Treaty which may arise between the High Contracting Parties will be settled bilaterally by peaceful means in a spirit of mutual respect and understanding.

The said Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty in Hindi, Russian and English, all texts being equally authentic and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in New Delhi on the ninth day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and seventyone.

On behalf of the Republic of India
(Sd.) Swaran Singh
Minister of External Affairs.

On behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
(Sd.) A. A. Gromyko
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

(From Appendix XI *India and the World* edited by A.P. Jai 1972)

APPENDIX D

Simla Agreement

AGREEMENT ON BILATERAL RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Following is the text of the Agreement on Bilateral Relations between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan signed at Simla, July 2, 1972.

(1) The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan are resolved that the two countries put an end to the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto marred the relations, and work for the promotion of a friendly and harmonious relationship and the establishment of durable peace in the sub-continent, so that both countries may henceforth devote their resources and energies to the pressing task of advancing the welfare of the peoples.

In order to achieve this objective, the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan have agreed as follows :

(*i*) That the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations shall govern the relations between the two countries.

(*ii*) That the two countries are resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations or by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon between them. Pending the final settlement of any of the problems between the two countries, neither side shall unilaterally alter the situation and both shall prevent the organization, assistance or encouragement of any acts detrimental to the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations.

(*iii*) That the prerequisite for reconciliation, good neighbourliness and durable peace between them is a commitment by both the countries to peaceful co-existence, respect for each other's territorial integrity and

sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

(*iv*) That the basic issues and causes of conflict which have bedevilled relations between the two countries for the last 25 years shall be resolved by peaceful means.

(*v*) That they shall always respect each other's national unity, territorial integrity, political independence and sovereign equality.

(*vi*) That in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they will refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of each other.

(2) Both Government will take all steps within their power to prevent hostile propaganda directed against each other. Both countries will encourage the dissemination of such information as would promote the development of friendly relations between them.

(3) In order progressively to restore and normalize relations between the two countries, step by step, it was agreed that:

(*i*) Steps shall be taken to resume communications—postal, telegraphic, sea, land including border posts and air links including over-fights.

(*ii*) Appropriate steps shall be taken to promote travel facilities for the nationals of the either country.

(*iii*) Trade and cooperation in economic and agreed fields will be resumed as far as possible.

(*iv*) Exchange in the fields of science and culture will be promoted.

In this connection, delegations from the two countries will meet from time to time to work out the necessary details.

(4) In order to initiate the process of the establishment of durable peace, both the Governments agreed that :

(*i*) Indian and Pakistani forces shall be withdrawn to their side of the international border.

(*ii*) In Jammu and Kashmir the line of control resulting from the cease-fire of December 17, 1971 shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognized position of either side. Neither side shall seek to alter it unilaterally irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretations. Both sides further undertake to refrain from the threat or the use of force in violation of this line.

(*iii*) The withdrawals shall commence upon entry into force of this Agreement and shall be completed within a period of 30 days thereafter.

(5) This Agreement will be subject to ratification by both countries in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures, and will come into force with effect from the date on which the Instruments of Ratification are exchanged.

(6) Both Governments agree that their respective Heads will meet again at a mutually convenient time in the future and that, in the meanwhile, the representatives of the two sides will meet to discuss further the modalities and arrangements for the establishment of durable peace and norm-

alization of relations, including the questions of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees, a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir and the resumption of diplomatic relations.

INDIRA GANDHI	ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO
Prime Minister	*President*
Republic of India	*Islamic Republic of Pakistan*
Simla, 2nd July 1972	

(From Appendix VIII B, *India and the World* edited by A. P. Jain 1972)

Index

Index